Pacific School of
Religion
Berkeley, Calif.

THE ART BINDER
BERKELEY, CA

THE CONSTRUCTIVE QUARTERLY

A JOURNAL OF THE FAITH, WORK AND THOUGHT OF CHRISTENDOM

Edited by Silas McBee

Volume IV

Pacific School of Religion
Berkeley, Calif.

HUMPHREY MILFORD
OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS
LONDON, EDINBURGH, MELBOURNE, AND BOMBAY
NEW YORK: GEORGE H. DORAN COMPANY
1916

KSI
C766
v.4

Copyright 1916
By George H. Doran Company

CONTENTS

Volume IV

March to December, 1916

Adeline, Duchess of Bedford.
The Place of Suffering in the Spiritual Life..... 613

After the War, What?
By Charles H. Robinson, D.D..... 486

Aggressiveness in Christian Advance.
By Francis J. McConnell, D.D..... 498

Appreciation of Another's Faith.
By Gilbert Reid, D.D..... 260

Archbishop Theodore: English Church Reunion in the Seventh Century.
By Benjamin W. Wells, Ph.D..... 187

Basic Call for the World Conference on Church Unity, The.
By Junius B. Remensnyder, D.D., LL.D..... 151

Besse, Clément.
Intellectualist Theodicy in France..... 124

Best, Nolan R.
The Free Church Viewpoint..... 280

Bevan, W. L., Ph.D.
George Cassander..... 619

Bishop French.
By Eugene Stock, D.C.L..... 843

Bréhier, Louis.
Normal Relations between Rome and the Churches of the East before the Schism of the Eleventh Century..... 645

Cadman, S. Parkes, D.D.
The Organic Unity of Christ's Church..... 458

Calvet, J.
French Literature During the War..... 582

Catholic Protestantism.
By Dugald Macfadyen, M.A., F.R., Hist. S..... 737

Catholicity.
By Herbert Symonds..... 526

Catholicity and Nationality.
By Richard Roberts..... 160

Christian Certainty and Gospel Preachers.
By Francis J. Hall, D.D..... 748

Christianity, A Unifying Power in War-Time.
By Ernest Rochat, D.D..... 172

Church and Secularist Democrats, The.
By John Edward Mercer, D.D..... 363

Church and the Choir, The.
By Archpriest Leonid Turkevich..... 244

Crisis of the Church, The.
By W. P. Paterson, D.D., LL.D..... 673

Dissenter's Apologia, A.
By Bernard L. Manning..... 722

Du Bose, William Porcher, M.A., S.T.D.
Incarnation..... 425

Du Bose, William Porcher, M.A., S.T.D.
Resurrection..... 788

Evdokin, The Most Reverend.
The Mystery and Might of the World..... 508

Farquhar, J. T. F., M.A.
The Holy Eucharist..... 73

Free Church Viewpoint, The.
By Nolan R. Best..... 280

French Literature During the War.
By J. Calvet..... 582

Fundamental Characteristics of New Testament Christology.
By Reinhold Seeberg, D.Theol., D.Phil. et Jur... 112

Future of English Nonconformity, The.
By William Edwin Orchard, D.D..... 541

George Cassander.
By W. L. Bevan, Ph.D..... 619

Glover, Terrot Reaveley.
Immortality and the Person of Jesus Christ..... 90

Glover, Terrot Reaveley.
Jesus and Man 801

Gorgas, W. C.
Sanitation and Morality 320

Hall, Francis J., D.D.
Christian Certainty and Gospel Preachers 748

Holy Eucharist, The.
By J. T. F. Farquhar, M.A 73

Immortality and the Person of Jesus Christ.
By Terrot Reaveley Glover 90

Incarnation.
By William Porcher Du Bose, M.A., S.T.D 425

Inge, William Ralph, D.D.
The Justice of God in History 440

Intellectualist Theodicy in France.
By Clément Besse 124

Islam at Its Best
By Samuel Marinus Zwemer, D.D., F.R.G.S 823

Jesus and Man.
By Terrot Reaveley Glover 801

John Dury.
By Newman Smyth, D.D 406

Justice of God in History, The.
By William Ralph Inge, D.D 440

Kantian Philosophy and Christian Theology, The.
By George W. Richards, D.D 343

Lutheran Church in Holland, The.
By Dr. J. W. Pont 548

Macfadyen, Dugald, M.A., F.R. Hist. S.
Catholic Protestantism 737

Manning, Bernard L.
A Dissenter's Apologia 722

McConnell, Francis J., D.D.
Aggressiveness in Christian Advance 498

Mercer, John Edward, D.D.
The Church and Secularist Democrats 363

Michelet, Georges.
The War and the Moral Crimes 297

Movement Towards Christian Unity, The.
By David S. Schaff, D.D 211

Mozley, John Kenneth.
The Two Levels of Religion 707

Mystery and Might of the World, The.
By the Most Reverend Evdokin 508

Niebergall, Friedrich, D.Theol.
Prayer and the Answer to Prayer 50

Normal Relations between Rome and the Churches of the East before the Schism of the Eleventh Century.
By Louis Bréhier 645

Orchard, William Edwin, D.D.
The Future of English Nonconformity 541

Organic Unity of Christ's Church, The.
By S. Parkes Cadman, D.D 458

Orthodox Church of Antioch, The.
By Ivan Ivanovich Sokoloff 761

Orthodox Church of Constantinople, The.
By Ivan Ivanovich Sokoloff 1

Paterson, W.P., D.D., LL.D.
The Crisis of the Church 673

Place of Suffering in the Spiritual Life, The.
By Adeline, Duchess of Bedford 613

Pont, Dr., J. W.
The Lutheran Church in Holland 548

Prayer and the Answer to Prayer.
By Friedrich Niebergall, D.Theol 50

Reid, Gilbert, D.D.
Appreciation of Another's Faith 260

Religious Consciousness as a Psychological Fact, The.
By Herbert L. Stewart 567

Remensnyder, Junius B., D.D., LL.D.
The Basic Call for the World Conference on Church Unity 151

Resurrection.
By William Porcher Du Bose, M.A., S.T.D 788

Richards, George W., D.D.
The Kantian Philosophy and Christian Theology . 343

Riley, Lester Leake, M.A.
Social Worship 377

Roberts, Richard.
Catholicity and Nationality 160

Robinson, Charles N., D.D.
After the War, What? 486

Rochat, Ernest, D.D.
Christianity, A Unifying Power in War-Time 172

Sanitation and Morality.
By W. C. Gorgas 320

Schaff, David S., D.D.
The Movement Towards Christian Unity 211

Seeberg, Reinhold, D.Theol., D.Phil. et Jur.
Fundamental Characteristics of New Testament Christology 112

Selbie, W. B., M.A., D.D.
The War, Revival and Reunion 235

Smyth, Newman, D.D.
John Dury 406

Social Worship.
By Lester Leake Riley, M.A 377

Sokoloff, Ivan Ivanovich.
The Orthodox Church of Antioch 761

Sokoloff, Ivan Ivanovich.
The Orthodox Church of Constantinople 1

Some Aspects and Problems of Missions in the Far East.
By Robert E. Speer, M.A., D.D. 30

Speer, Robert E., M.A., D.D.
Some Aspects and Problems of Missions in the Far East 30

Stewart, Herbert L.
The Religious Consciousness as a Psychological Fact 567

Stock, Eugene, D.C.L.
Bishop French 843

Symonds, Herbert.
Catholicity 526

Theology from the Viewpoint of the Science of Religion.
By Dr. George Wobbermin 329

Turkevich, Archpriest Leonid.
The Church and the Choir 244

Two Levels of Religion, The.
By John Kenneth Mozley 707

War and the Moral Crisis, The.
By Georges Michelet 297

War, Revival and Reunion, The.
By W. B. Selbie, M.A., D.D. 235

Wells, Benjamin W., Ph.D.
Archbishop Theodore: English Church Reunion in the Seventh Century 187

Wobbermin, Dr. George.
Theology from the Viewpoint of the Science of Religion 329

Zwemer, Samuel Marinus, D.D., F.R., G.S.
Islam at Its Best 823

A Journal of the Faith, Work and Thought of Christendom

THE CONSTRUCTIVE QUARTERLY is issued in March, June, September and December of each year.

ALL EDITORIAL COMMUNICATIONS should be addressed to Silas McBee, Editor, THE CONSTRUCTIVE QUARTERLY, 200 Fifth Avenue, New York.

ALL BUSINESS COMMUNICATIONS should be addressed to the publisher, Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press, Amen Corner, London, E. C.

Edited by SILAS McBEE

The Editorial Board

IN AMERICA

Rev. Peter Ainslie, D. D., Baltimore
Rev. William Adams Brown, D. D., New York
Rev. W. P. Du Bose, S. T. D., Sewanee
President Robert A. Falconer, C. M. G., Toronto
Chancellor J. H. Kirkland, LL. D., Nashville
Bishop Francis J. McConnell, Denver
President W. Douglas Mackenzie, LL. D., Hartford
Dean Shailer Mathews, D. D., Chicago
George Wharton Pepper, Philadelphia
Robert E. Speer, D. D., New York
Rev. Henry Van Dyke, LL. D., Princeton
Rev. W. H. van Allen, D. D., Boston

IN CHINA

Rev. J. Campbell Gibson, D. D., Swatow
President F. L. Hawks Pott, D. D., Shanghai

IN GERMANY

Excellency Dr. von Bezzel, Munich
Professor Dr. Adolf Deissmann, Berlin
Professor Dr. F. Loofs, Halle
Professor Dr. von Schlatter, Tübingen
Pastor Julius Richter, D. D., Berlin

IN HOLLAND

Professor H. T. Obbink, Utrecht

IN GREAT BRITAIN

The Bishop of Winchester, Farnham Castle
Rt. Hon. Arthur James Balfour, M. P., London
Rev. James Denney, D. D., Glasgow
Professor T. R. Glover, Cambridge
Arthur Henderson, M. P., London
Very Rev. W. R. Inge, D. D., London

Rev. James Hope Moulton, D. D., Manchester
Rev. W. P. Paterson, D. D., Edinburgh
Rev. William Sanday, D. D., Oxford
Rev. Principal Selbie, D. D., Oxford
Rev. William Temple, London

IN INDIA

The Bishop of Bombay, Bombay
Principal A. G. Fraser, Ceylon
Professor A. G. Hogg, Madras

IN NORWAY

Professor Sir Lyder Brun, Christiania

IN RUSSIA

Archbishop Platon, Kishineff
Professor Nicholas N. Glubokovsky, St. Petersburg
Professor S. V. Troitzky, St. Petersburg
Professor John Sokoloff, St. Petersburg
Professor Wladimir P. Ribinsky, Kieff
Professor Theodore J. Titoff, Kieff

IN SWEDEN

The Archbishop of Upsala

Committees in America, Great Britain and the Continent include as writers and co-operators:

Rev. John J. Wynne, S. J.
Mgr. Shahan, D. D.
Professor E. A. Pace, D. D.
Rev. John J. Burke, C. S. P., and others, *in America*

Father Thurston
Father Sydney Smith and others, *in England*
M. Georges Goyau
Mgr. Batiffol
M. Leonce de Grandmaison

and others, *in France, Belgium, and Italy*

Other members of the Editorial Board will be added from the Continent and the Orient.

THIS JOURNAL has been founded on the conviction that a constructive treatment of Christianity will make for a better understanding between the isolated Communions of Christendom. The destructive method has had its full opportunity and will continue to have it and ought to have it. But it has developed no power to unite and it is most effective in promoting division.

It is not neutral territory that is sought, where courtesy and diplomacy would naturally tend to avoid issues and to round off the sharp edges of truth and conviction, but rather common ground where loyalty to Christ and to convictions about Him and His Church will be secure from the tendency to mere compromise or to superficial and artificial comprehension. The purpose is to create an atmosphere of mutual confidence and to induce a better understanding and a truer sense of fellowship.

This journal is and must be unofficial. The Churches are not and in the nature of things cannot make themselves responsible for it. It will be responsible for the kind of writers admitted to its pages, but the writers alone will be responsible for what appears over their own names.

Two conditions are imposed: First, that the Faith and Work and Thought of each Communion shall be presented in its absolute integrity including and not avoiding differences; and second, that no attack with polemical animus shall be made on others.

THE CONSTRUCTIVE QUARTERLY recognizes the need that is finding expression in every organized Christian Church—the need of the impact of the whole of Christianity on the race. It has no scheme for propagating a system for the unity of Christian Churches. It will therefore have no editorial pronouncements. It offers itself rather as a Forum where the isolated Churches of Christendom may reintroduce themselves to one another through the things that they themselves positively hold to be vital to Christianity.

THE CONSTRUCTIVE invites the free, living and deliberate statement of actual, operative belief.

THE
CONSTRUCTIVE
QUARTERLY

The Orthodox Church of Constantinople

By I. I. Sokoloff,
Professor of the History of the Greek Eastern Church in the Imperial Ecclesiastical Academy, Petrograd.[1]

The Church of Constantinople has the place of honour among the other autocephalous Orthodox Churches of the East. Its historical destinies are linked in an immediate way with the Church of Byzantium, from which it has inherited its whole life and activity. Its history is the direct continuation of what preceded it in the past of the Byzantine Empire, on the ruins of which it still preserves its existence. As a state, Byzantium has fallen, but the Church of Byzantium still lives and continues its constructive activity, seeking a more complete self-definition in the Church of Constantinople, which is its spiritual successor. When Byzantium perished the best

[1] Translated by Vera Johnston

of its ecclesiastical traditions were passed on to the ecclesiastical neo-Hellenism, which in many ways still radiates the light of its glorious past. The Constantinopolitan Church of our time is still the Greek Church of the early Christian centuries, of Constantine the Great, of the Ecumenical Councils, and the brilliant mediaeval days, but in a different era which began when Constantinople fell, in 1453. It still is the Byzantine Church of old. Under the new conditions created by the downfall of the Empire and by a Mussulman monarchy spreading itself on its ruins, it has ever since been known under the name of the Great Church of Christ. It is this Church which is the subject of the present essay, especially its organization in the historical light of its recent past.

I

The exterior position of the Church of Constantinople at the present day is the direct outcome of the order which it received immediately after Byzantium was conquered by the Turks, and a new alien empire, with its own original political and social organizations, was started on the ruins. Constantinople fell under the arms of the Osman Turks, May 29, 1453. The death agony of the Byzantine Empire was long and painful, and Orthodox Christians bitterly lamented the fallen glory and the humiliation of the famous Cathedral of Sancta Sophia, which was turned into a Mussulman mosque. The Church of Constantinople endured, together with the Empire, all the calamities and privations of a long struggle with the Osman Turks. But, having lost in Constantinople the shelter of an Orthodox empire, it entered, in the second half of the fifteenth century, on a new period of its historical life. Within the Empire the Church stood as a separate organization, both ecclesiastic and civic, keeping the right to confess its faith, to perform its rites and to keep its own holidays. In the person of the Ecumenical Patriarch it had its own superior ad-

ministrative and legal power, the Holy Synod sharing this power; all the Orthodox clergy were free from all State taxation. In fact, the Church was entirely independent in governing the social life of the Greeks. In the schools it founded the teaching was done in Greek, adapted to the needs and demands of the local Orthodox communities. It owned the churches, monasteries, charitable institutions, ecclesiastical and private property. The Patriarch of Constantinople was allowed to be ecclesiastically *primus inter pares*, among the other Orthodox Eastern Patriarchs, that is to say, of Alexandria, of Antioch and of Jerusalem, the provinces and flocks of which were also part of the Turkish Empire. He was the representative of the Church of Constantinople, the presiding bishop in the Holy Synod, and the chief guide of the religious life in the whole Ecumenical Patriarchate. His duty was to carry out the decrees of the Holy Synod. He was the spiritual father, the chief pastor of clergy and people. In fact, he preserved all the spiritual rights and prerogatives of the Byzantine Ecumenical Patriarch.

Having preserved the supreme ecclesiastical power developed by Byzantium, the Patriarchs of Constantinople added to it considerable civil authority under the Turks. They were responsible before the Porte for the submission of all the Christians they represented, and for their strict compliance with the demands of the Government. The Patriarch saw that the Christians kept their oath of allegiance and, in case any of his people shirked obeying the Government, he was to remonstrate with them and advise them; when it was necessary, he had the right to arrest the culprits and to subject them to his condemnation and even imprisonment. Law cases, in which archbishops were involved, were examined in the capital in the presence of the Patriarch. If the civil law of the country demanded the arrest of a member of the clergy or a monk, the arrest could be made only

by order of the Patriarch. All the lawsuits of Christians concerning matters of marriage and inheritance by will belonged to the jurisdiction of the Patriarch. Even criminals were examined by the Patriarch. He also had the right of collecting money for the needs of the Church and Patriarchate from the clergy and laymen, and was to enforce the statutes of the trade guilds of Christians and of the various corporations, also the financial agreements of individuals. In general, the Patriarch of Constantinople was not only the spiritual head but also the civic chief of the Christians of all the Ecumenical Patriarchate. In fact, it can be said that under Turkish rule he acquired powers which he did not possess in the days of Byzantium, practically incarnating in his person the dual power of the Byzantine Church and State. Being the civil representative and the chief hierarch of the Church which in honour was above the other patriarchates, the Archbishop and Patriarch of Constantinople, the capital of the empire, the "new Rome", he had many actual prerogatives which the Patriarchs of Alexandria, Antioch and Jerusalem did not have, and so these latter had to deal with the Turkish Government through him, attending, with his help, to all their rights and duties in regard to their own patriarchates and their own flocks. As to the metropolitans, archbishops and bishops of the patriarchate of Constantinople, who within their own provinces had exactly the same rights and privileges which the Ecumenical Patriarch had in the whole Church of Constantinople, they could come into relation with the Porte concerning the affairs of their provinces only through his medium. In this way the patriarchate represented in its inner order a kind of separate Orthodox monarchy within the Mussulman monarchy, with the Patriarch and the Synod vested with the highest administrative and juridical authority.

Unfortunately at times this independence was merely *de jure*. The edicts of the Sultan in reality regulated

the inner freedom of the Church in every detail as well as the independence of the Patriarch, his rights and *pronomia*. The life of the Church was an uninterrupted series of privation and persecution, during almost five centuries. The treatment of Christians in Turkey showed that their right of independence was abused openly and systematically, in violation of all human dignity. As members of the empire they really had no equal rights with the others, for their cruel and inhuman conquerors could always find a way to take from them their possessions, their honour and their very life. At the election of every new Patriarch the edict of the Sultan enumerated all the rights of Ecumenical Patriarchs with many details, the edict always being solemnly handed to the new Patriarch. But in reality these rights became more and more disregarded and minimized. The Turkish statesmen constantly doing violence to the juridical rights of the Ecumenical Patriarch, his see in Constantinople, placed so unusually high, surrounded by a halo of glory and greatness, uniting in one person the religious and the national ideals of the Greeks, gradually began to decline, losing its radiance and becoming the weapon of the love of power and of party usurpation. And, of course, the chief cause of this humiliation lay in the antagonism of the Christian Church towards the system which was at the very foundation of its existence in a Mussulman empire. In its very essence this system was artificial and dissembling, having been dictated by no principle of conscious religious tolerance, but merely by political and economic calculation, diametrically opposed to the fundamental prescriptions of the Koran and the Mussulman law, which demanded an entire and perfect isolation of the Mussulman from the Christian; so it brought about violence and arbitrary dealings on the part of the one and servile subjection on the part of the other. It is clear that the order of a Christian community in Turkey, reposing as it did on principles which could not exist

side by side, contained in its very essence the possibility of every calamity.

And, indeed, beginning with the second half of the fifteenth century the history of the Church of Constantinople is an uninterrupted martyrology of the Orthodox clergy and their flocks under the Turkish yoke. The very Sultan Mahomet II (1453–1481) who established the new *modus vivendi* for the Church in Constantinople, was the first to break his own regulations. Christian churches were turned into mosques, Christians were islamized against their will. Men were ruthlessly massacred and women were outraged. Extremely heavy taxes were established. Christian cities were barbarously destroyed with all their memorials of Byzantine culture. The Patriarchs were prevented from using their own prerogatives; seven of them were deposed. These were some of the shameless acts of Mahomet II. His successors from Bajazid II (1481–1512) down to Abdul Hamid I (1774–1779) practised the same policy towards Christians. The Patriarchs at their election were forced to pay tribute, which gradually grew to be the tremendous sum of 4,000 gold pieces. Changing Patriarchs being of great material profit, the Turkish rulers very heartily approved of their change. Later on, beginning with the seventeenth century, having given its permission to the Patriarchs of Constantinople to take a trip into Russia for the purpose of collecting alms, the Porte accused them on their return of being so fond of Russia as to be politically untrustworthy, forcing them to spend Russian money to make themselves immune from the gallows. There even were some historically authentic assassinations of Patriarchs. After the execution of Parthenios III the Sultan ordered that in future the newly elected Patriarchs should not appear before him to receive their *berat*, that henceforward it was to be handed to them by the Grand Vizier (chief minister); he forbade them to use the palanquin at their official appearances, or to come to the Porte

accompanied by twelve metropolitans, as formerly it was their custom. The Patriarch's right of personal audience and receiving the *berat* from the Sultan's hand was restored only in 1834, under Patriarch Constantius II and Sultan Mahomet II. Owing to the constant changing of Patriarchs and the increase of taxations and bribes, which brought them immunity from all sorts of humiliations and insults, the treasury of the patriarchate was not only empty but burdened with various so-called palace debts. The Patriarchs suffered from lack of means, and the life of some of them was full of privations. In 1520, under Sultan Selim I, the first attempt was made to turn all Christian churches into mosques and to islamize all the Christians, or else to exterminate them completely as the enemies of the Prophet and his Koran. Christians prevented the carrying out of the latter intention by means of various testimonials and bribes, but their churches, both in the capital and the provincial towns, were almost without exception delivered into Mussulman hands. Instead of well built stone churches, the Christians erected low wooden buildings, without cupolas or bell-towers, with iron doors and grated, narrow windows almost under the roof, surrounded with high stone walls or thickly planted trees; and the poor sound of a wooden mallet striking a wooden board replaced the tolling of bells. Under Suleiman I, the attempt to make mosques out of churches was repeated, and much money was spent by the Christians. The same Sultan ordered the cross to be taken from the cupola of the Cathedral of Pammacarista (The Most Blessed Virgin), and, in 1586, the Cathedral itself was taken from the Christians and turned into a mosque, although Pammacarista had been the seat of the Patriarchs ever since 1455. The position of the patriarchate was very painful. Violence, insults, humiliations and murders were quite common occurrences. Christians suffered much from the central government, from the superior and inferior state officials,

from tax collectors and bailiffs, but above all from the fanatical janizaries and the crude uneducated Turkish masses. No nation was ever so oppressed by its conquerors; no nation ever suffered so much from a despotism which gave the Christians no chance to breathe freely, and forced them to hide their wives and daughters from the conquerors, to conceal their possessions, and even the exterior walls of their homes, in order not to give an impression of wealth. It was a despotism under which children, as soon as they were conscious, received impressions of servitude and oppression. *De jure* Murad IV destroyed the shameful duty of the sons' tithe, but *de facto* it lingered on for a long time. In Turkey, Christians had neither political nor civic rights; more than this, in spite of the *pronomia*, they were deprived of the right to confess their religious belief and were subject to constant persecution and suffering for Christ's sake. Many earned the crown of martyrdom for the holy Orthodox faith. According to the Greek records, there were about three hundred holy martyrs who were glorified by the Church of the East under the Turkish yoke. And who knows how many more remained unknown to history!

In the nineteenth century the position of Christians changed but little for the better. Sultan Selim III (1789–1807), it is true, entered the path of reforms and founded the Turkish *tansimat* (the organic law of the Turkish Empire) but his reforms were only relatively important and had only a limited application. His successor, Sultan Mahomet II (1808–1839) dispensed with the principles of the announced *tansimat* and directly opposed the Christians. Then began the bloody period of the Greek revolt of 1821–1826, which plunged the Church of Constantinople into such an abyss of calamities and horrors, that it seemed to be reliving the heathen persecutions of the early centuries. During this stormy time the Turks hanged Patriarch Gregory V., on Easter Sunday, and Patriarch Cyril VI, within the same week; eighty metropoli-

tans, archbishops and bishops, and a great number of clergy and monks were murdered. However, the Greek people came out victorious from this prolonged struggle with the enemies of Christian civilization, and built up a new home of Hellenism in the free kingdom of Greece. On the other hand, having concluded the Adrianople peace treaty with Russia, Mahomet II published, in 1839, the *Gulhani-hatti-sheriff* (an Imperial command), marking out the general basis for the future legislation which was to guarantee the safety of Christians in life, honour, property, regulation of taxes and the order of military service. But the aroused hopes of the Christians were not justified. The *Gulhani-hatti-sheriff* was but an adroit move on the part of Turkish diplomacy to draw the attention of the patriarchate away from Russia, and to place on Turkey, in the eyes of Europe, the obligation to protect Christians. Consequently, the reforms of Sultan Abdul Mejid (1839–1861) were few and not important. During the Crimean War Russia energetically defended the Turkish Christians. On the strength of the Treaty of Paris of 1856, Abdul Mejid published his celebrated *hatti-humayun* (irrevocable decree) accepting new obligations with regard to the *tansimat*, in the eyes of Europe and Christians. By the same move the government of Turkey secured for itself the protection of Europe against Russia's interference with the fate of the Christians. In reality, Abdul Mejid not only did nothing to legalize the social and economic conditions of the Christians, but even found in the *hatti-humayun* of 1856 a legal justification for starting a movement against the patriarchal authority, in order to shake the legal standing of the *pronomia*. This was attained by an application of the principle *divide et impera*. The Porte introduced strife and division between the Patriarch and the Holy Synod, between the clergy and the laymen. Towards the end of Abdul Mejid's reign the Christians were in a terrible condition, as witnessed by the official report of the British

Consuls in Turkey. Sultan Abdul Azis (1861–1876) was destined to publish laws in accordance with conditions formulated by the Treaty of Paris and the obligations of the *hatti-humayun*. And, indeed, under this Sultan, the Koran, the Shariat (religious and civil law), as the basic codes of the Mussulman law, and the numerous newly published volumes of the civil law were all placed side by side. It really seemed that a new era was beginning for the Christians in Turkey. But the belief that once a law is accepted it has to be complied with, and is binding on all cultured men, community or state, is entirely unapplicable to Turkey as regards the Christians. The laws of Abdul Azis were not published for any practical application to the conditions of the Christians in order to improve them, but merely as the fulfilment of a promise made to all Europe, as a kind of lightning conductor, in case Russia and the other powers asked questions and made demands. In reality these laws never were carried out, even to a small extent, and under Abdul Azis the Christians were just as badly off. Consequently Russia was forced once more to protect its co-religionists by armed force against the arbitrary persecutions of the Mussulmans. The last Sultan of the nineteenth century, Abdul Hamid II, began his reign by an adoption of a constitution, which was soon buried in the archives of the *dewan*. He continued by a systematic realization of the principles of Pan-Islamism, whose *motto* was "Turkey for the Turks", and an open persecution of the Church, and his reign ended by a regular bloody terror. After the bloody Abdul Hamid II was deposed, July 10, 1908, Sultan Mahomet V ascended the throne, and a constitution was announced in Turkey proclaiming the equality of Turks and Christians, and everybody's liberty. A good deal of time has gone by since then, but the position of the Church of Constantinople is in no wise improved. Constitutional blessings joyously greeted by the Christians have hardly touched

their existence and habits. Under the constitution the Christians are still without the protection of the laws. More than this, under the banner of the constitution the government of the Young Turks has undertaken a systematic campaign against the ancient rights and *pronomia* of the Church of Constantinople, trying to deprive it of self-government in interior affairs and to shake the foundations of its independent existence. Patriarch Joachim III, who died in 1912, and Patriarch Germanos V (since January 28, 1913) had to struggle very tenaciously and energetically against the Moslem Government in order to protect the ancient *pronomia* of the Orthodox Church, without which it cannot exist in a Mussulman state.

But now arose the terrific conflagration of the great European war, into the funnel of which Turkey was also drawn. Its red flames, arising over Constantinople, have also lit up the martyr existence of the Orthodox Christians in Turkey. More than once the all-consuming flame seemed to touch the Ecumenical Patriarchate, threatening to reduce to ashes the great autocephalous Church of Christ. Alarming tidings reach us of the total destruction by the Turks of the ancient ecumenical *pronomia*. But this must not be. Just is the word spoken by the Lord to the Church of Ephesus, in the Apocalypse: "I know thy works, and thy labour, and thy patience. . . And that thou hast borne much, and hast patience, and for my name's sake hast laboured, and hast not fainted" (Rev. 2: 2–3).

II

The Church of Constantinople existed during centuries in the midst of such uncertainty and privations, it was so overburdened, that the world should admire its patience. And, indeed, it is a wonder that the Greeks did not perish in the stifling Mussulman atmosphere, but on the contrary succeeded in saving their holy faith and the

rights and privileges of the Church. They preserved the sense of their nationality and kept their own language. In this is the greatest historical merit of their nation.

However, there are several factors which helped them in this glorious mission. First of all we must mention the saving guidance of the Great Church of Christ, which suffered as bitterly as the masses but always kept watching the purity of Orthodoxy, and helped the people in the struggle against their fanatical foes, preventing the Greeks from forgetting their great past, ecclesiastic, patristic, and historic. By doing this the Church not only saved the freedom of its own life, but was victorious over the treacherous Islam. Many are the glorious pages history preserves of the painful period when persecuted Christianity worked against the Mussulman dominion. Many are the pages marked by heroic self-sacrifice and achievement of the Patriarchs, always ready to lay down their lives for the faith of Christ. Their example was followed by hosts of bishops, priests and monks, and as to the uneducated masses, a stranger reading the Greek annals of this epoch hesitates what strikes him most—the force of the people's faith or the superhuman inventiveness of their cruel torturers. The Greek Church placed new foundations on the slain bodies of martyrs. To the end of time their glorious names will bear witness that in spite of persecution the true spirit of religion can be victorious over the crude power of despotism.

Another powerful factor was the activity of the *phanariots*, that is, the descendants of the Byzantine aristocracy. They added in support of the Orthodox Church the influence of what their national civilization had of the best; they founded schools, supported men of learning, and aided the Patriarchs in every possible way. On the other hand, the uneducated masses produced their *klefts* (heroes of the mountains), and their *armatoli* (bands of militia), who fought the Turks uninterruptedly, always hoping to overthrow the hateful yoke and to win the right

to a life of freedom and equality. Insurrections of Greek patriots of this type, knights-errant and heroes of the woody hills and gorges of Olympus, Pindus, Parnassus, Maina, Sula and Ida, did much for their country and their faith. The Turks were in real jeopardy through their efforts, and on the other hand, these efforts helped the Christians to hope for a better future.

Lastly, the terrible hardships of Christians under the Turkish yoke found fervent sympathy in Russia. During many centuries Russia helped its co-religionists financially and by offering them moral support and a safe shelter within its own boundaries. Ever since Peter the Great, Russia assumed the duties of diplomatic patronage and armed defence of Christians in Turkey. The treaties of Kuchuck Kainarji in 1774, and of Jassi in 1731, the "Greek Projects" in 1782, the treaty of Bukarest in 1812, the Convention of Ackerman in 1826, the treaties of Adrianople in 1829, of Paris in 1856, of Berlin in 1878—these are an eloquent testimony of the support Russia gave to the Orthodox Christians of the East.

And so, in spite of the centuries of strife and privations, the Church of Constantinople continued to exist and even to display an inner vital activity which expressed itself in its original administrative and judicial order and its lofty religious and moral standards.

III

During the Turkish period the Ecumenical Patriarch of Constantinople was the centre of the religious and national life of his people. His was not only the supreme ecclesiastical authority but a civic power also over all the Christian communities in Turkey, for he was entrusted with the duty of representation and responsibility for all the Christian subjects of the Sultan in both the religious and the social sense. The thoughts of all, in his province, were centred on the modest dwelling of the Patriarch, first in his house attached to the Cathedral of

the Most Blessed Virgin, and last, after several changes of abode, in Phanara, near the Cathedral of St. George. Everybody's eyes were on the brightly shining cross of the patriarchal cathedral, under which lived the spiritual master of the Christians, their lord, guide, and representative, invested with authority and power, trusted to guide the character and direction of the social and ecclesiastical life of the Greeks.

Since 1453 until now, the patriarchal throne has had 101 occupants, but there have been 161 elections, as some of the Patriarchs served more than once, in fact, from two to five times, and in one case six times. Even the General Canonisms of 1858–1860 failed to guarantee the Patriarch's election for life, or for more than three years. It was quite unstable, in spite of the *berats* and *firmans* of the Sultans or even the General Canonisms. No Patriarch was ever certain of his next day. Some members of the Porte were for ever scheming and intriguing against the Patriarchs until the middle of the nineteenth century. Still, in spite of all the instability of their thrones, the Ecumenical Patriarchs were enormously active. Without any doubt, they all were the best of their time and nationality, with highly cultured minds and lofty self-sacrificing ideals. On the other hand, they understood the practical problems and needs of the Christian people, and gave all their energies to the successful service of God. It is to the Patriarchs of Constantinople that the Greeks owe the independence of their Church and the intact purity of their Orthodox doctrine. Owing to the labours of the Patriarchs, the Greek nationality became *status in statu* in the midst of the Mussulmans, enjoying the truly Christian knowledge and living its civic and social life in all possible completeness. Even the less gifted and experienced of the Patriarchs faithfully guarded the traditional standards of their more talented predecessors. The minor clergy and the people also did all they could to give the patriarchal au-

thority to the most deserving, to realize which they often had to overcome great obstacles and to attain their object in the midst of the antagonism of the Porte, the squabbles of party interests and pressure from the outside. This was the reason why some of the Patriarchs came back to the office several times. None of them sought the responsibilities and heavy labours of the office, which was abundant in "great and bitter afflictions", but they answered the call of the Church, submitting themselves to the unanimous wish of the clergy and the people.

Until the middle of the nineteenth century the administrative and judicial order of the patriarchate preserved the type with which it had been stamped by the Byzantine organization. The present type is founded on the General Canonisms, which embodied a statute new to the Orthodox Christian subjects of the Sultan. It was composed in 1858–1860 by a special committee of clergy and laymen at the request of the Turkish Government, guided in its turn by the famous *hatti-humayun* of 1856. The patriarchate was reluctant to undertake these reforms as it was evident that the Turkish Government intended to use administrative reforms merely as the means for limiting the rights of the chief hierarch and introducing strife among the church workers.

The General Canonisms were formulated under extremely disturbing and unpropitious conditions; the new laws lacked many points and had many deficiencies; later on some of the Patriarchs even tried to revise them. However, after some fashioning on the part of the Porte the General Canonisms became the guiding law in the Church of Constantinople, influencing all its legal and administrative work.

The full title of the Patriarch is: His Holiness the Most Holy and Divine Lord and Master, the Archbishop of Constantinople and New Rome, and Ecumenical Patriarch. At present the throne is occupied by His Holiness Germanos V, one of the most cultured and energetic hier-

archs of the Orthodox East. He became especially prominent under the murderous Sultan Abdul Hamid II by his courageous defence of the Church prerogatives. We were told that, irritated by clerical opposition, this Sultan threatened to inflict severe punishment on the most zealous among the hierarchs. The Most Reverend, Germanos, who at that time (1890) was the Metropolitan of Heraclia, replied to this: "Your Majesty knows that the patriarchate has more gates than one, on which a lot of Archbishops can be put to death in the same way as Patriarch Gregory V", and he handed a rope to the Sultan. The patriarchate won that time.

IV

The Patriarch rules the Church with the collaboration of the Holy Synod. The Holy Synod consists of twelve metropolitans under the Patriarch's chairmanship, and according to an ancient tradition it is considered to embody the spiritual power of all the Orthodox Christians of the patriarchate collectively. The right of being called to the Synod belongs to all the metropolitans equally. New members are called for two years in succession, but one-half of the members, that is, six metropolitans, are renewed yearly. Only very aged hierarchs may refuse to take part in the synodal work. All the others must come to Constantinople without delay. Three months before the end of the year the Patriarch, together with the Synod, choose two men on each of three lists which record all the metropolitans, and it is an ancient custom that the first and the last on each list are called. The treasury of the patriarchate pays them, while they sit in the Synod, a small sum barely covering expenses. It is the Synod's duty to attend to all the spiritual needs of the people in accordance with the canons. They attend to the calling and transferring of archbishops, the preservation and improvement of monasteries and the theological school on Halki Island, the guarding of the

Orthodox Christians from all harmful outside influences able to distort their religious sense, the finding of worthy priests capable of preaching the word of God to the people, the publishing and spreading of books and manuals for the use of the clergy and the parishioners, and the keeping of their own printing press. In all these the Holy Synod is to deal directly with the diocesan archbishops, no interference from the outside being allowed. Any act of the Synod taking place without the knowledge and concurrence of the Patriarch has no force; neither has any act which comes from the Patriarch unassisted. On the other hand, the Patriarch is obliged to accept and carry out any resolution made by the majority of the Synod. It is the duty of the members of the Synod to work harmoniously with the Patriarch, showing him always the deference due to the chief hierarch. But if the Patriarch exceeds his spiritual rights and shows no wish to accept the remonstrance of the Synod, after the first and second time, the Synod must communicate with the members of the Mixed Council and repeat together with them the same deferential remonstrances. If afterwards the Patriarch still persists, the two institutions together present a written report to the supreme government and demand his deposition. The same process takes place if the Patriarch's error is of a civic nature, but in both cases, before any action can take place, it is necessary that two-thirds of the members of each institution should be of the same opinion. The Patriarch's attitude towards all the members of the Synod must be that of brotherly affection free from any influence of personal sympathies. If a member of the Synod speaks harshly to the Patriarch or visits some influential person without duly asking the Patriarch's permission, the latter is to speak to him privately in a brotherly way, then to do the same in the presence of the Synod, and only, if neither has any effect, is he to have recourse to severer measures. In voting and executive power, the members of the Synod

are exactly equal, no circumstance outside their synodal position having any influence whatever. If a vote is evenly divided, the preference is given to the side on which the Patriarch casts his vote. The Synod has a first and a second secretary, both chosen from the clergy, and its sessions are held three times a week. The synodal documents sent to the Porte must be stamped with the seal of six parts, each of which is kept by a metropolitan in the second year of his term, and the key of which is kept by the Patriarch. Every document is recorded and signed by the Patriarch and the Synod.

V

The other administrative institution in the patriarchate is the Mixed National Council. The origin of the Synod is lost in the remotest past, but the Council sprang up as a result of the General Canonisms, about 1860.

The Mixed National Council consists of four bishops and eight laymen. It is presided over by one of the bishops, appointed by the Patriarch. When the nature of discussions demands the presence of the Patriarch, he is to take the presidential chair. At the approach of elections for the Council, the Patriarch sends out a circular letter, and twenty-six candidates from the parishes are sent to Constantinople. The candidates must be over thirty, subjects of the Ottoman Empire of long standing, must have some experience of public affairs, must be respected by the Greeks and trusted by the Turks. The members are elected by a secret vote and introduced to the Turks for acceptance, after which they begin to discharge their duties during two years. The members of the Council are not paid and work for the good of their Church and their people. This Council also has two secretaries, for whom fluency in the Greek, Turkish, Bulgarian and French languages is obligatory. The Council

sits twice a week. The duties of the Council consist of taking care of the economic and financial conditions of schools, hospitals, and various charitable institutions, of controlling the activities of the officers of these institutions, of keeping account of the revenues and expenses of the Constantinople parishes, and the monasteries which depend on the patriarchate, also of examining lawsuits in which marriage dowries, legacies, and inheritances are concerned. Moreover, "every member of the Mixed National Council as well as every Orthodox Christian, having learned of some defection of those in Holy Orders, is bound to inform the Patriarch and the Holy Synod so that they may take necessary measures". Just in this prescription and in the one which orders the members of the Council to see that the Patriarch keeps the holy places of the Orthodox in beautiful condition within the Ottoman Empire can be found a motive for interference and obstacle-making on the part of lay members with regard to purely ecclesiastical affairs. The seal of the Council consists of three parts, the keeping of which is divided between the four bishops and the eight lay members, the key being kept by the chairman.

Besides the Holy Synod and the National Mixed Council there are some auxiliary institutions in the patriarchate with separate statutes and the duty of helping the Patriarch in the carrying out of his many-sided lofty and responsible functions.

These auxiliary institutions are: the Central Ecclesiastical Epitropi, whose special duty is to examine the affairs concerning, first, public divine services and church discipline, second, the clergy of the diocese of Constantinople, and the books on ecclesiastical and religious subjects throughout the whole patriarchate; the Central Pedagogical Epitropi, which manages the public instruction, and is responsible directly to the Patriarch; the Epitropi of Bishops' Property, which takes care of the possessions of deceased bishops and disposes of them

according to the bishops' wills and the demands of the General Canonisms; the Epitropi of Monasteries, which examines the reports of monasteries directly connected with the National Council and through it with the Patriarch and the Synod; the Epitropi of Controls, which revises the accounts of parish churches and schools; the Advisory Epitropi which counsels Christians on juridical and canonical questions.

There also exist Epitropies for the management of the patriarchal vestments, church plate and library, for supervising the great national school on the Halki Island, the publishing of the magazine of the patriarchate called "*The Church Truth*", and others. The patriarchate keeps a notary who certifies all kinds of documents concerning marriages, baptisms, kinships, legacies, etc.

Lastly, at the disposal of the Patriarch there is an Ottoman chancery which attends to the official correspondence between the Patriarch and the Turks. Around the Ecumenical Patriarch are gathered ecclesiastics and secular officers composing the patriarchal court. In Byzantium they used to be numerous and magnificent, but now there are but a few surviving remnants of past glories, many offices having mere titulary importance.

The Great Protosinkelos is the chief assistant of the Patriarch. He is a member of various Epitropies and acts as vicar in the parochial government, etc. The Great Logophet is the mediator between the Patriarch and the Turkish Government. He is a layman, a member of some aristocratic Greek family. He has the title of *arhont*, and there is a special rite of consecration at his entering office. The Patriarch elects him, but, as he has so much to do with the Porte, the consent of the Turks is necessary to his election. In the old days the Great Logophet's influence was tremendous in all ecclesiastical matters, but his importance is on the wane, owing to the Ottoman Empire having become constitutional and to some other circumstances.

VI

Until the last Balkan war, the Church of Constantinople consisted of one archiepiscopacy, eighty-eight metropolies, fourteen independent episcopacies, and two exarchates. Owing to the alarming political condition, the Church of Constantinople has not as yet been able to formulate its relation to the dioceses which ceased to be part of Turkey, according to the Treaty of Bukarest in 1913, and were allotted to Greece, Serbia, Bulgaria and Montenegro.

The archiepiscopacy, situated within Constantinople and its suburbs,is governed by Patriarch Germanos V, as Archbishop of New Rome. At the beginning of 1914 there were one hundred and twenty bishops and priests in this diocese, some of whom were rectors of parishes, and some of whom discharged the duties of confessors. Of these people with clerical training, the greater part studied in the Halki theological school, but there are some who attended the theological faculty of the University of Athens, some who graduated in the theological school of the Holy Cross in Jerusalem, and a good many who went to the secular schools where classical studies predominate (classic gymnasia).

The eighty-eight metropolies, as they exist now, are the result of a good many interior and exterior conditions which made the formation and dissolution of metropolies quite unusually frequent during the nineteenth century. The order of their formation is pointed out in the 38th Rule of the Sixth Ecumenical Council. The Patriarch of Constantinople keeps the list of all the metropolies, and their place on the list and the historical circumstances which accompanied their formation determine the titles of the metropolies of Caesarea, of Cappadocia, of Ephesus, of Heraclia, Nicodemia, etc.

Of the fourteen independent episcopacies, one is located in the metropoly of Ephesus, one in that of Smyrna, five

in Thessalonica, and seven on the Island of Crete. The two exarchates are located in Epirus and Patmos, the latter including the Monastery of St. John the Divine.

The number of Orthodox Christians in the Ecumenical Patriarchate was about 7,000,000 before the present war. Not a very great number, yet there are over a hundred dioceses, varied in character and independent of each other. The whole patriarchate is imbued with a tendency to vary the diocesan rule according to the historical past and the present needs of the people. The populations are far from indifferent concerning either the form their ecclesiastical government assumes, or its perfection, the cathedral position of their metropolitans, the place of their diocese on the lists of the Patriarch, its boundaries, etc. There is motion and life in those aspects of the ecclesiastical community where a superficial observer would expect nothing but superannuation and death.

Regulations forbid the people to take any part in the election of bishops, but in reality it happens pretty often that lay parishioners petition the Patriarch and the Holy Synod through their representatives in various institutions and corporations to send them this or that head pastor, whom they know and love. But it is a firmly established rule that the people are permitted to express themselves only in a positive way. Needless to say, the patriarchate is always willing to meet the wishes of the flocks halfway, whenever their opinions are just and well founded. The good of the Church and the interest of the parishioners are always the uppermost considerations of the patriarchate in all elections and transfers of bishops. Cases in which parishioners have protested against the decisions of the hierarchs are very rare, and have happened in the past under very unusual circumstances.

In general, the parochial life of the Patriarchate of Constantinople, for all the variety and complexity of its relations, even from the civil and social points of view, is guided and controlled by the diocesan bishops who are

responsible for every detail in the life of their dioceses both to the Patriarch with his Synod and to the Turkish Government.

VII

In the Church of Constantinople the parish is originally built. Of course, there, as in Russia, the parish is based on the principles of Orthodoxy; the objects of the two are analogous in their religious, moral and charitable work, both having the same lofty christianizing influence on the masses. But owing to the peculiar exterior conditions during the many years under the Turkish yoke, the parish of the Constantinople patriarchate has acquired characteristic vitality, mobility and energy in all its functions. Its communal principles have attained an especially striking development. The roots of the neo-Greek parish community are hidden in Byzantine antiquity, but, under the pressure of despotism and slavery in Turkish territory, its power has grown in intensity, its energy has increased under the necessity of constant centralizing, and has blossomed more luxuriantly in originality of form. Of course, its wealth of self-expression is not even throughout all the provinces of Turkey, which display wonderful variety under the influence of purely local conditions.

The parish unit of Constantinople is unlike the parishes in the metropolies of Asia Minor, and its organizations are very different in the freedom-loving Epirus and the independent little Islands of the Greek Archipelago. Every parish lives and acts, conforming to a statute of its own, written or merely traditional. Among the men of learning, Russian or Greek, none has as yet undertaken the hard task of studying and classifying the general and particular principles which guide these organizations. I have at my disposal an enormous accumulation of written and printed material. Without any attempt at exam-

ining and classifying it, I state here that the parish unit of the Ecumenical Patriarchate has reached a high degree of inner development. There are systematic gatherings of the clergy and independent parishioners for the election of church and school wardens, responsible to the parish; the funds collected in the parish pay for the keeping of churches and schools, the support of the clergy and school teachers, the hospitals and almshouses. If a parish is not strong enough to fulfil the duties of communal activity, two or three parishes join forces and found middle schools, pay for a doctor and maintain a board for charitable work, which sometimes includes the supplying of dowries to poor brides. The custom of electing their clergy exists in but a few parishes; in Pera, for instance, and in Chalcedon, but in most of the parishes the clergy are appointed by the diocesan bishop, with the consent of the parishioners in case they express an opinion. However, the parishes can work only under the supervision and authority of the diocesan bishop. All the parochial meetings take place with his permission, he sending his own *epitropos* to take the chair; all the elections must be sanctioned by him, the lists of voters as well as of candidates are also controlled by the bishop of the diocese. Throughout all the Ecumenical Patriarchate the collective and individual systems of church government work indivisibly together. The same blending can be observed in other manifestations of the ecclesiastical life all over the Orthodox East, and it is a characteristic inheritance of hoary Byzantine antiquity.

It should also be noted that under Patriarch Joachim III, who died in 1912, a special committee of priests and laymen composed a single general statute for all the parishes of the patriarchate, but it has never been made to act. One of the Greek metropolitans said to me, "It is impossible to make all the people wear the same dress."

VIII

At present, monasticism in the Church of Constantinople is far from being in the brilliant condition of the time when all Orthodox Byzantium was said to be one huge monastery. After the fall of Byzantium the number of monasteries and monks gradually began to decrease. The calamities and terrors of the Turkish régime impoverished the monasteries and made them scant. Turkish policy with regard to monasteries was the same as with regard to all the functions of the life of Christians. *De jure* monasteries were independent; *de facto* monks were persecuted and overtaxed. Mount Athos was less accessible to Turkish violence and continued to be the chief hearth of the religious contemplative life for Greeks and Slavs alike. The Greek revolt of 1821 struck heavily at Orthodox monkhood. Many monasteries were destroyed, the monks were slaughtered or ran away, the property of the monasteries was looted. Even Mount Athos was in danger, but was saved from complete destruction by the intercession of the Russian Emperor Alexander I. At the restoration of the monasteries in the nineteenth century, the monks showed no intense wish to come back. The growth of social interests, the improvements in the life of the Christians and the formation of the free Greek kingdom took the attention of many away from the quiet lonely life in the monasteries, attracting many towards worldly activities. When the General Canonisms were composed a short general statute for monasteries was also drawn, but it failed to revive monasticism. When, in 1864, the lands connected with the holy places of the East were confiscated in Rumania, the material support of many monasteries failed completely. Yet in the first half of the nineteenth century, historical annals refer to two hundred monasteries within the boundaries of the patriarchate. But Mount Athos is still the centre where monastic achieve-

ment is at its height, and ascetic virtues adorn a host of recluses. There are twenty monasteries, dating from long ago, many hermitages, cells and caves, in which salvation is sought by Greeks, Russians, Serbs, Bulgars, Rumanians and Georgians.

The interior order of the monasteries is still determined by the monastic statutes of Byzantium. The monasteries are divided into groups, according to their interior order, the kind of life led by the monks, and the hierarchal authority on which they depend. Some are diocesan, depending on the diocesan authorities, others are parochial, around whose church a whole parish had clustered, and there are also monasteries belonging to the private persons who built them. But in matters of ecclesiastical administration they all depend, either directly on the Patriarch or on the nearest diocesan bishop.

There are very few nunneries. Monasteries are governed directly by their priors, elected by the brethren, but accepted by the Patriarch or the nearest bishop. Archimandrites or hiero-monks may become priors. They are elected for life but may be deposed in cases of abuse of power, with the knowledge and by permission of the bishop. If the monastery is large enough, the prior does not govern it alone, but is supported by elders forming the prior's council. Any Orthodox Christian who is of age may become a monk. But before the final taking of the religious habit he is to undergo a probation during a more or less extended period. After taking the habit, the new monk is to submit to the moral guidance of an elder whom he must obey absolutely in all that concerns his monastic attainments. There are several grades which a monk may attain in connection with his moral perfection. The world concepts of modern Greek monasticism are the direct outcome of Byzantine asceticism, the sources of which reached their greatest purity and depth in the teaching of St. Gregory Palamas.

IX

The Greeks always were distinguished by their love of education. Founding a new parish, they begin to build a school at the same time with the church. After the fall of Byzantium, Greek civilization also declined. There was no more original scientific work. Men of learning became scarce, and the schools were able to follow only the most elementary programmes. But towards the end of the seventeenth century there began the renaissance of the Greek culture, and at the beginning of the nineteenth century it was able to show considerable results. For the most part, priests and monks were workers in this field. The Patriarch stood at their head, the *phanariot* aristocracy and the diocesan bishops helping him zealously. The monasteries were fortunately in possession (especially on Mount Athos) of magnificent libraries, collected when Byzantium was at its best, and these naturally preserved the bright lights of knowledge and attracted men of learning from all countries. The monasteries kept schools for teaching their own probationers and the children of the neighbouring villages. With the conditions of their own lives bettered, the monks increased and widened their work of public instruction. Later on, a university was founded in Athens. Learned Greeks entered into communication with Russian and Western men of learning; Greek youths were often sent to be educated abroad; the wealthy Greeks turned their philanthropy to educational purposes, and the Patriarch and his clergy gave systematic help—all this together greatly raised the educational standards in the Ecumenical Patriarchate. It must be remembered that, in spite of their enormous taxation, the Turks never helped the Christians in matters of education, on the contrary, hindering it and raising obstacles whenever they could. The educational progress of the country is entirely the work of the Church and the nation.

The patriarchate's centre of learning is the theological school on Halki Island, not far from Constantinople, where the clergy of all three grades receive their training. Almost all the metropolitans were educated there, completing their education later on in Athens, Russia and Western Europe.

Side by side with schools of various types, the patriarchate has other organs of culture in the so-called *syllogi* or "societies" and "brotherhoods". Organized by private people, these societies work in accordance with a definite statute, which has received the approval of the Patriarch or the local metropolitan, trying to bring in new members. The members' donations support the work of all such organizations. The *syllogi* and brotherhoods publish scientific books, pursue archaeological and historical investigations, found schools, libraries and reading rooms, arrange public lectures and discussions, and work to awaken the love of education in the Greek masses by every means at their disposal, thus helping the similar activity of the Patriarch. We must give the place of honour to the "*Philologicos Syllogos*" of Constantinople, whose fiftieth anniversary was celebrated in 1911. The objects of this society are scientific and literary, and it really takes the place of an academy of sciences for the enslaved Hellenism. This *syllogos* consists of several divisions: philosophic, historic, archaeological, medical and juridical; political economy, philology and *belles lettres* are also among its subjects. Its activity is very estimable and its scientific merits quite considerable.

Among the provincial societies of this kind we must mention the one in Smyrna. It has many members who support people's schools and subsidize several popular preachers of the Word of God. In 1911, this society founded a religious weekly under the chief guidance of Chrysostomos, Metropolitan of Smyrna.

The condition of theological science cannot be expected to be flourishing, after all the unpropitious centuries under

the Turkish yoke. But the nineteenth century, at any rate, can boast of a considerable group of learned men whose productiveness is noteworthy and is still increasing. At present all those interested in the past history of the Orthodox Church could not dispense with the knowledge of modern Greek writings, especially in the ecclesiastical and historical branches. In short, it is time to give up the notion that modern Greece has no theological science. This is a mere prejudice created by the enemies of the Greeks and of the Orthodox Church. Of course, the serious drawback of the Middle Ages still exists: "*Graeci sunt, non leguntur.*" The prejudice is hard to fight, but still it is our fervent wish that, in the nearest future, the Church of Constantinople shall stand out among the other Orthodox Churches of the East in the true halo of its past martyrdom and the well-earned glory of its true worth. So be it!

Some Aspects and Problems of Missions in the Far East

By Robert E. Speer, M.A., D.D.,
Lay Secretary of the Board of Foreign Missions of the Presbyterian Church in America.

A recent visit to Siam, the Philippine Islands, Japan, Chosen and China has brought into clearer outline some aspects of the missionary enterprise in the Far East which had been already discerned and has suggested some new reflections.

It is no longer possible to speak of the changing West and the immovable East. Once perhaps the East lifted its head to see the legions thunder by and then dropped to sleep again, but from that sleep there was a waking long ago. And nothing more clearly illustrates the unity of the world than the oneness of the forces which are moving today in the life alike of the East and of the West. We have been travelling through these lands at the time of the European war, which is ten thousand miles away, but we have seen the effects of the war in every country where we have been and have realized clearly the truth of what Mr. Paish of the *London Statist* wrote some years ago of the economic community which the whole world has now become:

"In fact there is no nation or people or individual which is not affected beneficially or prejudicially by the welfare or misfortune of all the world. A disaster from earthquake, from disease, from drought, from war, which falls upon any nation in these days affects the welfare of the whole world in greater or less degree, and on the other hand the progress of thought, the spread of education, the advance of invention, the growth of production, and, indeed, all things which raise the moral and material welfare of any nation,

bring in their train advantages to the whole race. Experience of the benefits of the increasing dependence of nation upon nation, which has been gained in the last century from the removal of the physical barriers which used to divide them, and from the supply of capital by one country to another, affords some idea of the great well-being to which the whole world will attain in the years that are yet to come from the ever growing movement towards the economic unity of the race."

Back of this economic unity lies the great fact of the moral unity of mankind. Once denied in theory and still often repudiated in practice, this truth is nevertheless making itself realized in every nation. In collision with it conceptions of ethnic religion, of zonal ethics, utterly break down. And if humanity is one, it must go on to find the one truth which can satisfy its deepest needs and guide to its largest destiny. The whole movement of the world's life today toward a deeper consciousness of its oneness is both a preparation and a search for Christianity.

The idea that America is the great melting pot of the nations needs supplementing in the light of the facts of other lands. New York is indeed a great maelstrom of the races but they are almost exclusively the Western races. Honolulu presents an even more wonderful laboratory of racial intermixture with its population of 26,041 Hawaiians, 3,734 Asiatic Hawaiians, 8,772 Caucasian Hawaiians, 21,674 Chinese, 79,674 Japanese, 22,303 Portuguese, 1,900 Spanish, 4,890 Porto Ricans, 695 Blacks and Mulattos, 14,867 other Caucasians, and 7,269 miscellaneous. The Malay peninsula is another crossroads of the races. Here 11,065 Europeans, 10,807 Eurasians, 1,412,196 Malays, 915,883 Chinese, 267,170 Indians, and 32,849 from other races are poured into one of the greatest whirlpools of racial cross-breeding that can be found on the earth. A common language, unified communications and the strengthened national life are drawing together a dozen different strains in the Philippines. The Japanese and Koreans are engaged in an enormous racial interblending adopted as a deliberate

governmental policy. In Bangkok one-fourth of the population is Chinese, and that population does not mark the limit of Chinese blood in the city. In addition there is a large population of Indians and Malays, there are Burmese and Shans, Eurasians, Cambodians, Laotians, Annamites, Javanese, Japanese, and a dozen Western nationalities. The isolation of the races has passed away. Not only are ideas running across the world contemptuous of all national boundaries, but the racial bloods seem to be flowing to a common level.

The deeply impressive fact as one views all this movement in Asia today is that the movement is not the enterprise of individuals. Individuals are borne on the movement. What one feels is the heave of a mighty tide of life moving through the world, greater than men, greater than nations, bearing men and nations onward in the grip of great forces that clearly have an order within them and a purpose to fulfil. Both men and governments seem to be like playthings in the hands of these unseen energies. Economic facts are much stronger than men, and the man must be blind who cannot see that back of these economic facts, and handling them with a wisdom and a will that are absolute, stands God. As Mr. Outerbridge said once in a paper on shipping and its influence upon international unity,

"So irresistible are the unseen forces bringing to the surface more enlightened views as more difficult conditions arise, that it suggests the question—whether the all-wise Creator is not using economic law and necessity as one of the greatest fundamental forces in uplifting the moral character and mental vision of humanity."

It is increasingly clear that in this great process of progress those races will be able to serve best and contribute most which can bring into the common treasure the best character and the purest faith. It is the want of character, or of those qualities of character which make living progress possible, which is holding back the Asiatic races. In some qualities of character they surpass the Western nations but not in the qualities that contribute

to living progress. In those qualities perhaps the character of India is most deficient, so that Mr. Dickinson's remark is justified, that India has more to gain and less to lose in the contact with Western peoples than any other Asiatic nation. But increasingly all the peoples of Asia are beginning to feel their need of the constructive and collective principles of life which are sweeping the world onward under the leadership of the Western races and which have the purest fountain of their virtues and the best corrective of their vices in Christianity. Yuan Shi Kai is reported to have said, "I am not a Christian, I am a Confucianist, but unless the ethics of Christianity shall dominate the scholarship of China, there is no hope for the Republic." It is not a question of domination merely. The real problem is one of energization, and it is not a matter of Chinese scholarship alone but of Asiatic character.

It is not personal character alone that is needed although that is the fundamental thing. It is personal character so generalized and massed that it can function through a national consciousness. The Eastern nations are becoming aware of this also, and at the same time that they have to find the springs at which individual character can be formed, they must build the sense of national personality, which can only be built out of a right racial character in which the virtue of personal and family life is collectively massed. Some of the Asiatic nations are in danger of thinking that the national personality can be developed by itself, but most of them are realizing that the two must come together.

It is not to be wondered at if some of these peoples, who are struggling so hard to develop a national consciousness, are slow in rising to the thought of that higher nationality for which our small present political nationalisms are but the preparation, and every Western example which sets the nation above humanity is a blow at the processes of progress in Asia and sets back the slow

struggle of the Asiatic nations out of their isolation into the larger fellowship and ministry of mankind.

Nothing is more important than that we should stimulate the faith and courage of the Asiatic nations in their struggle. It is pitiful to see an individual man who has lost the hope that he can ever attain or achieve. It is yet more pitiful to see a nation which has begun to despair. "I sometimes wonder," said an able Indian who had been educated in Great Britain, "whether it will ever be possible for us to do it. We can see the goal but we seem to lack the nerve to win it." It is a dreadful thing when this mood creeps from individuals into the consciousness of a race. We ought to do everything in our power to build up instead the spirit of hope and boundless confidence in every race, not that it can do everything that every other race can do,—our Western races are utterly unequal among themselves—but it must be made to feel that it can make its contribution and do its work and that no other race can fulfil its mission for it. Anything that we do in trying to help the Eastern races, either governmentally, educationally, or through religion, will be an injury to them and an offence to the boundlessly hopeful and trustful spirit of God, if it results in undermining the right ambitions and the just pride of Eastern peoples. If, sometimes, these ambitions appear to us excessive and that pride, a foolish thing, we ought still to rejoice that they are erring on this side instead of on the side of a craven acceptance of the doctrine of their inferiority. I think there is a principle here which we need to keep much more clearly in view and which has its large bearing on such problems as the teaching in English in Chinese schools and the development of independence in the native churches.

At this time of increasing intimacy of racial relationships and of over-wrought racial suspicion, it is the duty of Christian men and especially of the missionary enterprise to set an example of just and generous race judgment.

It is often necessary to form our minds and to express them on the subject of particular acts, but it is a dangerous thing to extend these judgments on acts into judgments on racial character or national purpose. The present governments in the Far East have as much claim to purposes of good faith as any other governments and we ought to judge them precisely as we would wish to be judged ourselves. To condemn them because they are Oriental, to express of them a distrust which we do not feel toward Western governments "because these are white men's governments", is not only un-Christian, it is foolish and wrong. In his *Fifteen Decisive Battles of the World*,—in the chapter on the victory of the Americans at Saratoga, Creasy wrote:

"The importance of the power of the United States being then firmly planted along the Pacific applies not only to the New World, but to the Old. Opposite to San Francisco, on the coast of that ocean, lie the wealthy but decrepit empires of China and Japan. Numerous groups of islets stud the larger part of the intervening sea, and form convenient stepping-stones for the progress of commerce or ambition. The intercourse of traffic between these ancient Asiatic monarchies, and the young Anglo-American Republic, must be rapid and extensive. Any attempt of the Chinese or Japanese rulers to check it, will only accelerate an armed collision. The American will either buy or force his way. Between such populations as that of China and Japan on the one side, and that of the United States on the other—the former haughty, formal, and insolent; the latter bold, intrusive, and unscrupulous—causes of quarrel must, sooner or later, arise. The results of such a quarrel cannot be doubted. America will scarcely imitate the forbearance shown by England at the end of our late war with the Celestial Empire; and the conquests of China and Japan by the fleets and armies of the United States, are events which many now living are likely to witness. Compared with the magnitude of such changes in dominion of the Old World, the certain ascendance of the Anglo-American over Central and Southern America, seems a matter of secondary importance. Well may we repeat De Tocqueville's words, that the growing power of this commonwealth is '*Un fait entièrement nouveau dans le monde, et dont l'imagination elle-même ne saurait saisir la portée.*'"

To this paragraph in the text Creasy added the following foot-note:

"These remarks were written in May 1851, and now, in May 1852, a powerful squadron of American war-steamers has been sent to

Japan, for the ostensible purpose of securing protection for the crews of American vessels shipwrecked on the Japanese coasts, but also evidently for important ulterior purposes."

This was the interpretation which one of the noblest-minded historians of his time placed upon Commodore Perry's expedition to Japan. Whatever we may think of this judgment of Creasy's we ought to think regarding similar judgments of our own. Now and then a nation may have a government so bad that it deserves to be called wholly bad, but no nation was ever as bad as that, and Christians are the last people in the world who are justified in forming or expressing an indiscriminate judgment of suspicion or condemnation against any race. We ought to credit every race with a better character than it has. We ought to hold for it a higher and nobler faith than it can hold for itself until it becomes a Christian race. It was by His belief in possibilities of human character which were not actual that Jesus Christ made them actual. The faith of the missionary enterprise in the races for whom it works should be as the faith of Christ in men and in man.

"Why what but faith, do we abhor
And idolize each other for—
Faith in our evil or our good,
Which is or is not understood
Aright by those we love or those
We hate, thence called our friends or foes."

These general reflections have a deeper significance for missions than it is necessary to point out further, but one other word should be said regarding the place of missions as a force in this movement of human progress. Government, trade, education and religion are the four great agencies which are at work in this process. It is not necessary to say which of them is the more powerful, because the principles and spirit of true religion should pervade them all. And yet we do believe that the work which religion is to do is the most important work of all and those men and women who go out with their lives, the example of their homes, to live among the non-

Christian nations, to teach them new truth and to incarnate that truth before them in individual character, in the fundamental social institution of the family and in the life of the community, are the greatest factors of progress and are using the most fundamental and effective method. They represent in the purest form the truth of which, in its political correlation, Professor Reinsch speaks in his book on *Colonial Government*,

"The idea that a numerous population, covering large territories, cannot by political means be raised *en masse* to a higher stage of development, and that, if political and social progress is to come about in such regions, the advanced methods and institutions must first be worked out in smaller areas, in cities and towns, which may thus become a model to the surrounding country—this idea is based on the soundest knowledge of the laws of politics. To civilize by bayonets, to educate by force, to render moral by laws, these are all Utopian notions, although they appear under a strangely un-Utopian guise. Peoples like individuals can be deeply and permanently influenced only through a more quiet, less obstrusive appeal to their inner nature by example. It may be the example of righteous living, or the example of efficient methods in political administration and in industry. Industrial example has done more to transform the Orient in the last decade than has all the political action of centuries. To impose upon a backward people institutions excellent in our eyes, but for which its historic experience has not as yet fitted it, is vanity and folly; to give within a limited sphere and area the example of correct methods and honest work would seem an approach to a statesmanlike policy."

The work that missions are doing and the mere presence of missionaries, especially if they are American missionaries, in any field exert influence far beyond our understanding. Most of this influence is just what we would wish it to be, but some of it perhaps, with or without our knowledge, takes forms that we might not have desired to give to it. In one sense, of course, all this can be left to that great energy of life of which I have spoken, which is working in the world and which sweeps along the endeavours of men toward the great ends of God, but nevertheless we are not excused from the duty of perpetually scrutinizing our influence to see if in any regard we can strip it of elements of weakness and bring it more fully into accord with the central and untrammelled spirit

of the gospel. We cannot go out as other than American missionaries. What we are, we are. But we certainly can strive to lay aside our Americanism and to appear instead as catholic men representing the universal gospel. Certainly we can avoid the folly of Fourth of July celebrations in mission schools. We can use the national flag rather than our own. We can refrain from teaching history with too much of the American accent. We can remember that it is the gospel that was proclaimed in Palestine, and not an American version of it, that we are to carry, and that our business is to help the races to which we have gone to achieve a character that is all their own. If, on the other hand, it is proclaimed in China and throughout the world that American mission schools produce republics, we can only wonder that there is not less unrest in neighbouring lands with regard to what we are doing there. We must make it clear that we are not an agency for the dissemination of political ideas but are ministers to the racial character and nationality to which we go.

No enterprise is more in need of calmness, of patience, of steady ability to hold the perspective, of clear discernment of the large and distant, not to be lost in the small and near. Missions ought not to be rushed into precipitate action, especially in that borderland where the problems of missions and the problems of government interlace. The Church of Christ has time, all the time there is, and while she needs to be in haste in her own work, she can afford to wait indefinitely for the settlement of any problem which she cannot settle on the spot by love and faith.

It is more evident to us than ever that the Christian church is the fundamental institution in the missionary enterprise, and that the establishment of a real church with its own life and government unsubsidized and undirected, but standing on its own feet and co-operating with us or making a place for us to co-operate with it,

should be the normative principle of mission policy. We should aim to build up local congregations and unite these in national churches, and in a field where several denominations are at work it is our conviction that the churches which they all establish should be united from the beginning, as they have been in the Philippine Islands, nominally, and as they ought to be, organically. If this is not done at the beginning the present conditions in Japan will suffice to show how difficult, if not impossible, it is to do later on. The non-Christian peoples are well experienced in religious sectarianism. There was complaint when we were in Japan from fifty odd Buddhist sects and a dozen or more Shinto sects because only one of each was to be represented at the coronation. If we once establish our separate denominations in the mission field, custom, natural affection, vested interests, the desire of institutions to preserve their integrity, and all the human motives which enter into the maintenance of our divisions at home, will come into play. And worst of all, the voice of the church will be a divided voice, and Christianity will not be able to make itself felt as it would through a strong united life, testifying by its unity and its love to the possibility of these very things for which each nation is seeking, and which it can realize only through its full surrender to God in Christ.

Because the church is so central and important every effort should be made to give it right character and to see that it is made up of true Christian men and women. Doubtless the Christian faith and character of its members will be very immature at the beginning. That is all the more reason for making sure that what there is is real and for providing agencies for the education and development of the church. There are some of our missions which would do well to give careful heed to an article in the *International Review of Missions* by Johannes Johnson entitled *The Importance of The Catechumenate*, from which a few sentences may be quoted:

"If the missions and the native churches neglect this question, if they allow indiscriminate baptism and think that restrictions and the catechumenate in any thorough form should be reserved only for admission to first communion, they are sure to create in all heathen lands the same kind of baptized heathenism under which the western world is suffering. Perhaps the least of the evils to which this will lead is the disdain, disparagement and neglect of Christian baptism which at present is spreading over all the Christian Church. . . How our Lord is going to shape the future history of the Church is His matter. But our concern and duty is at every turn of our way to do the right thing. It is only by so doing that we can be used by Him to create a sound method for the progress of His kingdom. Now in this matter His clear order from the beginning has been that we should baptize those who sincerely want to be His disciples. The only possible way to ascertain whether this state of mind exists is to have a solid catechumenate before baptism. When we have done this, we shall be able to see later what the Lord is going to do. For my part, I am inclined to believe that a strong catechumenate and a regular baptism of adults is the elementary condition of every sound church and should never have been abandoned in the churches of the West."

Adequate educational training of catechumens should be maintained systematically in the case of church members and made an agency of training of the church in ceaseless evangelistic work.

And the greatest need of the churches and the missions is, I believe, a sustained and glowing evangelism. The equipment of our missions is not everywhere adequate, and those who cannot serve the work abroad otherwise than by giving their money at home to provide more equipment have an ample field still open to them. But the primary need of our work is not more equipment, it is for more evangelistic energies coursing through the equipment that we have, the schools, and the hospitals, and the chapels and church buildings. Regarding the moral and the social results of missions there can be no doubt. Those who object to missions because they are ineffective in influencing society, choose the weakest point of attack. The point at which Christians who believe in missions are least satisfied is in the matter of the drive, the persistence, the patience, the longing of the evangelistic work and of all our work in its evangelistic utilization. We are further away, it seems to me, from the accomplish-

ment of our aim of evangelization, than from the accomplishment of any of our other missionary aims. A wise and thoughtful writer in an article on the relation of missions to civilization in the *International Review of Missions*, for July 1913, has said that it would appear that the mere process of evangelization, the mere making known of the message concerning God in Christ to the world, is a task now nearly accomplished. Would that one could believe this. No one could be where we have been and not be constrained to think that instead of being nearly accomplished, the task has been scarcely begun. It is the long, long work. No one can tell when it will be done. It is the magnitude and the endlessness of it that appal one and make it difficult to awaken and to keep at ruddy glow the evangelistic fervour.

Whether the number of Europeans in Asia will greatly increase in the near future is a matter of uncertainty. Much of the work for which the Eastern nations have been obliged to employ Europeans will be done by Asiatics. There are many European commercial communities in the Far East which have not grown. There has been quite an increase of business, but it has been brought about by the entrance of Asiatic traders into the field. On the other hand, the steady unification of the world throws the shuttles of race ever to and fro across the web of life and there may be a steady or a spasmodic increase of foreigners in the East. It is most important both to the East and to the West that the moral character and influence of this element should be helpful. The general testimony is that it is increasingly helpful. Old business men in a city like Yokohama testify that the general tone of the foreign community has steadily advanced and that while in these communities, as everywhere in society, the outstanding individual may not be as conspicuous as he was when a few great merchants largely dominated this field of trade, nevertheless the average has risen and the moral purity of life become more

creditable to the West and more helpful to the East. Between these European communities and the missionary body, there is in general now a much better feeling and understanding than there was twenty-five years ago. There has been a return to the good spirit of the earliest days when men like John C. Green and his associates founded the medical missionary society in Canton and when the Oliphant ships again and again served the missionary enterprise. There is still, however, a great work to be done in recovering the wreckage of European life in Asia and in awakening every motive that may protect our young men who go to Asia on business from sinking down to the basest levels of moral life about them. It is clear that racial self-respect and pride of racial integrity are not sufficient to accomplish this. They seem to be very superficial qualities. Witness the horde of Eurasians in Asia born of the very men who are loudest in their boasts of these virtues. Pride of loyalty to the best moral ideal of the race does suffice to hold many men who live their lonely lives in cleanness or who honourably marry women of Asia and leave a pure inheritance to their children. A large body of Eurasians possess this pure heritage. But the pride of race fails in thousands of other lives.

Mere environmental religion also fails, and one is tempted to wonder, from what he sees in these lands, how much of our American religion is integral to men and how much is merely environmental. All along our way we met with men who had been open in their church relationships at home and sometimes active in their Christian service, from whom the whole thing had slipped away as a garment when they came out to the Far East. There must be something more than racial pride or borrowed religion to hold men true and to make them strong to render moral service in the uplifting of the East. They need the iron of the moral law, tempered and forged into steel in the furnace of the love of Christ. And if they

are to be held to all that is best and highest when they come out to the East they need to ally themselves at once with the Christian church. The Young Men's Christian Association is doing a useful work but it has found itself almost impotent to accomplish anything in this field, and where it is trying to do so, feels that it meets here its greatest problem. One of its secretaries told me frankly that he knew of no young men who were being held absolutely faithful to the ideals of moral purity who had not connected themselves with the church and were not openly identifying themselves with its worship and its work. Among Asiatics and Europeans alike, the indispensable and supreme agency is the Christian congregation.

It is both exhilarating and pitiful to see the eagerness of Asia to acquire the English language. It is exhilarating because it is a sign of the hunger of the world for unity and for a common speech, because it reveals the intellectual awakening of Asia, because it opens to the Asiatic people ranges of literature and knowledge otherwise inaccessible, because language is a living thing with an indwelling spirit which moulds those who open themselves to it. Their own languages are a heavy burden on some of the Asiatic peoples. The Chinese ideographs which Chinese and Japanese must learn lay a task of drudgery and memorization upon the young mind which is crushing. It takes years for a Chinese child to learn the language by which he is to learn other things. The Japanese have simplified the matter a great deal by the "kana" characters which are a sort of alphabet and which in the newspapers are printed in parallel columns with the regular characters. There is a strong movement in Japan to introduce Romaji, that is, to substitute for the characters, the phonetic sounds expressed in Roman letters. The effort to introduce this reform in China and Japan, however, meets with immensely greater difficulties than our reform spelling encounters at home. It is sad

to reflect that in Korea the cumbersome Japanese language seems likely to supplant in due time Korean with its wonderfully simple and beautiful alphabet, and that in Siam the Siamese letters are already displacing the far more beautiful Lao.

But while the demand for English is exhilarating there is something sad about it. So much of the demand is purely commercial and, while not unworthily so, it testifies to the dreadful necessity, under which the greater part of Asia lies, of construing all the values of life in terms of one day's bread. It is sad also because so often the eagerness for the new is indiscriminate and what is trivial and unworthy is taken in with the good, while that which was good and worthy in the old is discarded with what was useless or bad. It is now and it may be even more in the future the duty of the missionary enterprise to do what it can to protect the Asiatic peoples from themselves and to help them to conserve the good of their own past which otherwise they would throw away. Few greater evils could befall Asia than that it should make the mistake of excess imitation of Western civilization in its present form or that it should impoverish the stock which it brings for the reception of the new graft.

It fills one with wonder to see the way in which the non-Christian religions are undergoing transformation, in their tendency, partly conscious, and partly unconscious, to slough off the weaknesses which contact with Christianity has revealed, and to develop whatever resemblances they may have to Christianity, and to borrow from it so far as they can what it possesses and they lack. The whole tendency brings into clearer view the things that are strong and unique in the gospel. It may reveal also things in the gospel that we had not so clearly seen. It has revealed and will reveal nothing that the gospel of the New Testament, understood in its fulness, lacks. As Dr. Denny says, in his commentary on II Corinthians, speaking of the first six verses of the eleventh chapter:

"There is no comparison between the Gospel of God in Jesus Christ His Son and any other religion. The science of comparative religion is interesting as a science; but a Christian may be excused for finding the religious use of it tiresome. There is nothing true in any of the religions which is not already in his possession. He never finds a moral idea, a law of the spiritual life, a word of God, in any of them, to which he cannot immediately offer a parallel, far more simple and penetrating, from the revelation of Christ. He has no interest in disparaging the light by which millions of his fellow-creatures have walked, generation after generation, in the mysterious providence of God; but he sees no reason for pretending that that light—which Scripture calls darkness and the shadow of death—can bear comparison with the radiance in which he lives. 'If' he might say, misapplying the fourth verse—'if they brought us another saviour, another spirit, another gospel, we might be religiously interested in them; but, as it is, we have everything already, and they, in comparison, have nothing'. The same remark applies to 'theosophy', 'spiritualism', and other 'gospels'. It will be time to take them seriously when they utter one wise or true word on God or the soul which is not an echo of something in the old familiar scriptures."

This absoluteness of Christianity is sometimes construed by us in exclusive rather than inclusive terms and the gospel that has sent us out as the servants of men insensibly operates to make us their masters. The superior prowess of the Western peoples, their advancement in knowledge, their mastery of applied science, the conscious maturity and strength of their political judgments, the too ready acknowledgment of their own weakness and inability on the part of the Oriental peoples, the energy of Anglo-Saxon character against inertia or inefficiency, the quasi-consular status which extra-territoriality has given and which now and then one meets a missionary who is reluctant to give up just on this account, because he sincerely believes that such a position of superiority increases his influence as a representative of the gospel,—these and many other things make it difficult to keep the spirit in which alone Christ can be truly represented to men and the gospel of human unity proclaimed. A letter from a missionary in China whom I honour and love, which came to us in Shanghai just as we were leaving the field, states the whole matter better than any words of mine can:

"Now that I have lived for some years in the Orient I know a good many things about the difficulties of missionary work that I did not know before coming here. One of the greatest hindrances, to my mind, to the coming of the Kingdom here so far as we missionaries' shortcomings are concerned, is the feeling of race superiority or arrogance that gradually springs up in a foreigner's heart. I think our race is naturally an arrogant race and the whole circumstances of our life here make it easy for this kind of feeling to take possession of us. I mean such things as extra-territoriality, our influence simply because we are foreigners, the lack of backbone of the Chinese, the knowledge of our race's achievements, etc. As I have tried to examine my own heart it seems to me that most missionaries go through the same experience. We start in often with great sympathy for the people, trust in them because they seem so open and attractive, but gradually, partly through disappointment with individuals but most of all through the subtle influence of a feeling of race superiority that most all foreigners in the Orient seem to have, we begin to put up a barrier between ourselves and the people which I believe to be a very real hindrance to the spread of the Gospel. We do not so openly display this spirit and sometimes we are able to hide it, but nevertheless it is a factor to be dealt with. I don't think the great mass of the people realize that the missionaries are this way, but I think the educated ones often see it, the returned students, for instance, and it is a real hindrance. Canon Robinson in a little book entitled *The Interpretation of the Character of Christ to non-Christian Races*, in Chap. I., expresses what I mean. He says that we are weak on the side of patience, humility, meekness, non-resistance, which is the side of the Christian character which particularly appeals to the people of the Orient. I find that the mingling of this side of the Christian character with firmness, honesty, justice, the hatred of hypocrisy is one of the very hardest problems I have had to face. As soon as you go out of your way to be kind, and try to treat the Chinese as you would a foreigner, he will as a general rule take advantage of it, and the average person who starts in with the idea of treating the people as real friends and brothers is too often apt to give up this attitude unless he is completely deceived by them and does not see through their exterior. It is very hard to express in a letter just what I mean, but it is a real factor. This creeps into our conversation when no Chinese are listening. When I first came out, one of the things that struck me was the lack of reverence of missionaries for the personality of individuals such as a Christian ought to have. This is of course largely influenced by the fact that the Chinese do not have this respect for one another. Our social life is for the most part almost completely cut off from them. Of course I know that this is partly inevitable, and they on their part don't admit us into their families the way they do one another. However, there are some with whom it would be possible, our educated clergymen for instance, and the English-speaking students who have graduated and are in various occupations. I can sympathize with the missionaries in this failure of ours because I have failed in this respect too, but I am making a conscious effort to overcome this defect. If I were to go home now, I would not feel much like appealing for money, but rather that the

Church at home would give itself to more constant prayer that we out here would be more completely filled with the love and humility of Christ and be given greater wisdom and insight as to how to interpret this love. I want the Church at home to know where we are failing, for I feel that, as a body, we are failing very greatly to manifest the atoning life of Christ. It is easy to help in famine work. or to do what we can to protect them during fighting, compared to humbling ourselves before them as individuals and having enough sympathetic insight that we can sense their feeling about matters. I remember one of my teachers whom I learned to love greatly, often used to say that the greatest mystery of all to Paul was the unity of the human race in Christ. Being brought up such a strict Jew accounted for his wonder. I can better appreciate Paul's wonder now."

The absolute unselfishness of the missionary movement needs to be guarded with scrupulous care. Other agencies of international influence may properly include an element of self interest. "The banker", said Mr. Seligman, referring to the negotiations attending such transactions as the Chinese loans, "never loses sight of the resulting advantage to accrue to his own country". The missionary ought to lose sight of every such advantage utterly. The enterprise should be stripped of every aspect of interest. It goes out to the nations, asking nothing, seeking nothing, naked of every political alliance. It does not exist to promote commerce, to secure for the nations from which it comes any more good will of the people to whom it goes than it seeks to secure for all other nations. Our American missionaries are not in China to promote trade or intercourse or better feeling between China and the United States. They are there to advance the cause of human unity, to hasten the day when all men shall be brothers, not to bind two races together in political and commercial relationship, but to bind all men together in Christ. As Professor Reinsch writes,

"There can be little doubt that the success and the moral authority of missions is being jeopardized by their connection with politics, and by the political purposes which, often against their will, they are made to subserve. The missionary who goes forth unaided to face countless hardships, and to battle against the hostility of nature and of savage man, merits the respect of all, and gives the best kind of guarantee of his aims and intentions. But when the State stands ready to turn his high-minded and unselfish heroism into a source of

material gain to itself, and to make use of it for purposes of national expansion, there is danger that the missionary may lose moral power and be looked upon as a mere political emissary. Moreover, the unity of Christian missionary work is liable to be destroyed by having its field of work broken up arbitrarily into national areas. Tendencies such as these should be earnestly discouraged in order that the missions may retain their value as agencies of redemption and improvement. Missionaries in all parts of the world are voicing their opposition to the close connection of missions with politics, which destroys the confidence of the natives and robs the missionary of his influence as a protector of the native against every kind of exploitation."

This is very justly spoken. Missions must be saved from any such confusion for the reasons of which Professor Reinsch has spoken and for the deeper reasons which have been already stated.

Over the inner doorway of the institute which Dr. Whitewright has built up in Tsinanfu, one of the most remarkable missionary agencies in the world, is this inscription:

"The aim of this institution is to show through all its agencies God manifest in nature, in the world, and in the teachings of Jesus Christ the Saviour of mankind.

"It seeks to illustrate human progress and the principles on which that progress must be forwarded; to enlighten in all that makes for the welfare of China and the Chinese people; to bring East and West together in the knowledge of the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man.

"'Have we not all one Father, hath not one God created us all?' Malachi.

"'God hath made of one blood all nations of men.' St. Paul."

In conclusion, are not these our great missionary problems: How to generate a spontaneous, unsubsidized and self-sustained evangelism in native churches made up of truly believing, growing Christian men and women; how to secure in these churches a leadership true and bold and freely led of God; how to keep and increase the personal and individual service in the midst of the heavy institutional and general activities of missions; how to bathe the work in sympathy and comprehension, lifting it above all suspicion and spiritual contractions; how to apply the same sympathy and comprehension to races

as well as to individuals, and how to be ourselves more wise, powerful, contagious workmen. "What I long for", wrote one of our missionaries in Japan as we came away, "is more courage and more power. These seem to me to be the great needs". Are they not? What needs can be greater than these? The need of the perfect love that casts out all fear and of the strength made perfect in weakness which says, "My Father worketh and I work."

Prayer and the Answer to Prayer

By Friedrich Niebergall, D. Theol.,
Professor of Practical Theology, University of Heidelberg.

War, which sets all astir, not only makes great demands on every Christian's work but addresses earnest questions to his mind as well. First surely among these stands the question how all war's horrors can be reconciled with the love of God and its results with His justice. But in the second place there comes immediately the question of prayer and the answer to prayer. In the mouth of the mocker that question, as we know, takes the form: How perplexed God must be when all the warring nations beg victory, each for his own arms, and He can of course give only one side the victory. That question, however, is not only frivolous but stupid. For if a position or a commission is to be awarded, however many may compete for it, he who has it to bestow can alone know whose petition he will grant. So, too, God will know to whom He is to give the victory, or rather, when the victory is won, every true believer in God can have nothing else to say than that God ordered it so. Far nearer lies today another question which concerns so many individuals. Over how many soldiers in every army may prayers to God be hovering, like invisible angels, for their preservation and happy return, sent day by day to the throne of God in anxious hours by those at home. Surely the praying heart of many a mother or wife believes that her prayer can guard the beloved life better than breastwork or shield. And then all at once comes the fearful news. With it there crumbles not

only what till then had been the pride and happiness of life but what had been the inner reliance of the soul: If prayer in this most vital thing, when all else fails, avails nothing, what use is prayer after all? Who knows how much faith has been shaken in these dreadful months? Here surely is reason enough to grapple once more, perhaps by new means, with the old question of prayer and the answer to prayer.

1

We may begin with the common definition of prayer as it is found in many textbooks: Prayer is the converse of the soul with God. Let it be noted at the outset that this explanation goes far beyond the common assumption which makes prayer equivalent to petition: prayer must have quite other contents as well. What does it mean: To speak with God? How is God conceived? He is conceived as a spirit with whom one can speak, that is, as a personal and conscious spirit who can hear and will hear what we have to say to Him. He is spirit of our spirit, a creation of our thoughts, as the mockers say; or, we are of His spirit, a work of His thoughts, as believers maintain. In any case, believing men find in themselves a will to which they can trust themselves. In the main they can answer to the question: Why do they believe and do this? absolutely nothing else than that it impels them to do so. We have in us the ineluctable necessity to put above us, above life and the world with all its being and becoming, a Will that is like us and yet exalted far above us. This Will mingles in our weightiest thoughts and decisions; it is always with us when we contemplate weighty things and tasks; it is like an *idée fixe* in us, from it we derive, immediately or through some sort of mediation, those great facts and events that grip our lives; with the thought of it we make our weighty resolves, we make it part of all our action. Or, if we do not do this, we reckon it our neglect. To many a sober man it may in-

deed seem strange to see how we are compelled to relate everything to such an invisible companion and master. If we look closely we shall see that in fact it is the great events and decisions that clarify our thought of God. Some emotion is always involved. If that is not the case we are speaking not of a religious cognition of God but of a philosophical one, as when one discusses the supposition that the world is created by a God or that the moral law is to be referred to Him. When we are piously minded there is always an emotion involved, as joy or sorrow, hope or fear, love or hate, resignation or renunciation. That means that in religion we are concerned, not with indifferent concepts, but with life and growth, for it is values and possessions that are at stake. That is why religion cannot be uprooted, why the struggle about it is far intenser than that about purely theoretical things, for here, as in morals, we have to do with life, with the upholding of each and of all.

How do the several aspects and acts of the religious life come into being? When an emotion which expresses the relation of the innermost impulse of life to the goods of life attains a certain strength it evokes automatically in the soul the image of God, who is conceived as the master and guardian of these goods. In connection with this image of the supernatural personality of the Lord of life and of the world the emotion experiences a change, it becomes concentrated personally. Thus for instance gratitude arises from joy. Joy is feeling as it lives in the soul without that relation; if the image of the personal God arises dominantly in it then it becomes related to Him and is transformed into gratitude. Or, the feeling of resignation when it is joined to the image of the Holy God becomes sacrifice. Of course the nature of the emotion affects the image we form of God. To the happy mind of the grateful, God seems the Gracious Giver, while for the pious man who is forced to abnegation, He becomes the stern Master who imposes bitter sacrifice

upon him. By these two examples we have already indicated what a scope those emotions have which thus let themselves be transformed into fundamentally religious states of mind. Joy that becomes gratitude is only one of the feelings that express our attitude toward all that we passively suffer and experience; abnegation that becomes sacrifice belongs to another group which embraces the feelings that play rather about our action. There is no doubt at all that the first take the larger part in the sphere of religious life, for as a rule men feel themselves touched by God more when they experience something than when they do something. Let no one attribute it to a mere delight in systematic statement if we try in the development of our thought about prayer to bring together the feelings which in connection with the image of God become fundamentally religious emotions, for the several kinds of prayer will be found, by and by, to correspond to them.

In what relation do our experiences stand to our feelings? Experiences may lie in the past, they may fill the present, they may stand before us in the future. Experiences of the past or from the present which have helped our living continue long to awaken our satisfaction and our joy, while others cause pain and bitterness. As joy in relation with God became gratitude so pain grows into a low or loud reproach toward the Guider of our life, while bitterness becomes a striving with Him, after the fashion of Job and the Psalms of Lamentation. As a rule it does not stop with mere passive feeling, there is in it usually, unless it becomes dulled and exhausts itself, the impulse to lead in some fashion to action. If it is to follow that first impulse two roads lie open to it, that of declared action, with men and things for its object, or the way of prayer, which turns to God. At this point we shall have to take up the matter presently. Experiences that impend awaken also feelings of pleasure or pain; to those belong hope, to these fear. In relation

to the personal God those take the form of trust, these of mistrust. From both spring manifold other feelings in which there lies already a strong active impulse. These are especially the wishes that in view of what impends address themselves to the Ruler of the world; their substance is that He may grant the one and either remove or forfend the other. That prayer proper, in the sense of petition, enters here needs no mention. That sacrifices and other efforts to dispose God favourably, whether one trusts Him or not, belong here is also immediately obvious.

If we look to the other side, that of our own activity, we call the happy contemplation of past action moral satisfaction, the painful, repentance and shame. If again we relate these feelings to God, as the Lord and Judge, to whom we are answerable, the former will become the good conscience, the latter the bad conscience and fear of the Judge. Serious considerations of what we have to do become resolutions; if great and far-reaching matters are involved, these are brought before God and weighed beneath His earnest eyes. Often, too, antagonistic inclinations contend in us and we fight out the struggle between them under those same earnest eyes, until under His influence the evil is overcome and the good comes to mastery.

Beside all these feelings which are concerned with our own persons, there are naturally many others in our breast which also enter into relation to our conception of God, and may take the form of prayers. Now it is the love of others, our family connections, our neighbours, now of our Church, our Fatherland. The deeper this love is and the more it knows how the fate of the beloved lies in God's hand, the more it joins itself to God and expresses itself in wishes that may be more urgent than those for one's self. Or, the feeling for all that is beautiful and great and exalted, the feeling into which no interest enters save the sense of the height and the depth

of the world and of life, turns into a feeling for God, who is Himself the beauty and the depth and the height, whether He expresses Himself in the universe, in the beauty and power of nature, or in the depths of the individual soul.

2

Such is the life of Christian piety. The I relates its important content to another I that it conceives as a mighty and beneficent Lord and on whom it knows itself dependent, as it is answerable to Him for its acts. What then is prayer? Such a relation between the human and the divine I can remain hovering in the realm of thought; now and then, for a moment, the thought of God flits through the soul, if it happens to be religiously stirred by events or decisions. Then, too, one may imagine there is such a relation without its being actually realized. In such a world of supposition and fancy many doubtless are living who count themselves religious. But a real relation to God comes first into being in one of two cases. First: When we wish to act according to the mind of God or Jesus against our own flesh we see in the conflict that spirit and flesh wage with one another that the matter is no dream or supposition but bitter earnest. Not till we have established God's will against our flesh have we won a truly real knowledge of the living God. But that happens also in prayer. When one of those necessities fills our soul and oppresses our I then, too, we learn to establish that relation between our real I and the eternal I. Then we learn to speak with God. We speak with Him then as we speak with some exalted and beneficent man, for indeed some such person, be it father or king, is the model on which we form and fashion our thoughts and feelings in relation to God. Thus prayer and a personal conception of God go together. Whoever practises prayer cannot think pantheistically. Among all the many expressions of piety that the war has brought to light

pantheistic piety has retreated into the background, where it belongs if we are concerned not with impressions and theories but with the bitter earnest of life. One who thinks of God personally is really inconsistent if he does not pray. For to what purpose does a high and beneficent personality exist for us if we do not pour out our hearts to it?

Thus out of each of the pious stirrings that we have noted above there arises a kind of prayer. As from joy before God came gratitude, so from gratitude comes thanksgiving. Gratitude passes over from the airy form of feeling into the stable form of thankful words to the Giver of all good gifts. As, on occasion, one says to one's father or friend or superior: "I thank you," one says it to God. Or, out of the feeling of yielding to the will of God, who has imposed or is imposing some hard thing on us, comes the word of submission, "Thy will be done." Or, as out of hope before God came trust and out of fear before God came anguish, so out of these two grows the prayer, "Lord give," or, "Lord take away." Under the pressure of a present necessity that will not be gainsaid, embitterment becomes lament and supplication. Or, out of feeling of one's own weakness and faith in a mighty God there comes prayer for strength to bear evil according to His will. From the side of our action the case is the same. Decisions before God become vows, renunciations, sacrifices. Repentance before Him becomes confession of guilt: "Before Thee only have I sinned!" Further, the love in God, into which we gather our neighbours and the communities of which we form part, becomes intercession. Out of the recognition of our weakness the prayer for strength becomes, not alone that we may bear our sorrows, but that we may do the hard thing. Finally, these last named religious feelings, joy in God and marvel at His works, become worship of His greatness and glory in nature and human history, as well as in one's own petty I.

Thus the scope of prayer is extended far beyond petition, of which one is apt to think when one undertakes to solve the problem of prayer, just as it is to that form of prayer that under the pressure of necessity people are apt to resort. And in fact it is here that the greatest difficulty arises for our consideration, where prayer seeks, with the help of God, to change something in the external world or in the heart of man himself. The case is much simpler with prayers whose purpose is to attain a state of mind toward things as they have been or have become, for in these the petitioner acts, while the other prayers seek to evoke action by God. Similar is the case with prayers that concern our own acts past or future. In such prayer our action is complete in itself, whether it be a vow, a confession or a sacrifice. Those prayers in which there is demanded an act of God in accord with the mind of the petitioner shall be examined later. These, in which there occurs an action of the petitioner in accord with the mind of God, shall first be fully treated. For, as it happens, these offer to thought fewer difficulties than those; and yet, if we mistake not, they are less used, just because the needs of the body and of the soul impel to prayer more than the pressure of feelings that ask from God nothing else than just the attentive ear of His goodness to tell Him that of which the heart is full.

3

To relate to God all that belongs to the sphere of life, all that one experiences, receives from His hand; to do and leave undone in His sight all that one does and leaves undone, that is the life of faith; that, too, is the content of prayer, so far as it is not petition. In prayer one learns to add an I, that is, a personal participation, to all those activities of faith, especially if any sort of resistance to them makes itself felt.

It is a pity that so few pious people have learned how

to participate in the deep happiness that is contained in thanksgiving to God for events that bring joy or for happy days. If some joyous event comes quite unexpectedly or long-desired into our life, if father or son returns from the war, if convalescence comes at last, if a victory is won,—how warm and generous then rises the impulse from the soul's depths to seek a Spirit whom one can thank for it all! Happy he who knows then the way to the throne of God! Then the vibration of the soul rings out in joyous thanksgiving to God. This thanksgiving to Him to whom in faith we attribute the event, gives it its significance, gives it place in a vaster, holy process, above all, preserves it from pride and takes from happiness the poisonous sting that inheres in it always. This purely passive contemplation of all good ought also to be granted to common days on which no more has occurred than the daily round of little pleasures and the absence of more than ordinary annoyances. With the evening offering of a silent thanksgiving to God we take conscious possession of simple happiness and enjoy it once again, instead of slipping off past God's best gifts as men so often do. Thus thanksgiving involves the recognition: All this good is from God, and this recognition reacts on our own mood, creating conscious joy and humble trust in the God who will continue to bless in things both great and small.

In prayer, too, we make our own those days that please us not. If we receive these, too, from the hand of God, it becomes easier to bear them, for "God" means that they have come not by chance or evil will of man but from a Will that has put a meaning in them. Thus one can get by prayer into accord with destiny or by prayer make destiny part of one's own being. It is often very, very hard, for everything in us struggles against it. But just for that reason we need the authority of God to convince and overcome ourselves. So, in time, we become reconciled to our misfortune for we are reconciled

with our God. His power has ordered it so, and behind His power we have already often found, though perhaps not till long afterward, a meaning, and that meaning was goodness and wisdom, even though at the moment we could not see it so. And, if bitterness rises again and again, earnest prayer ever conquers it once more until under the influence of time, and of what time brings, it fades at last away. So if we accept our fate from the hand of God, with the recognition that it comes from God, the same process occurs as in thanksgiving. Mischance loses its embittering effect, as happiness does its sting.

Experience and action cannot be so sharply distinguished in life as can passive and active in the grammars, and so, often enough, the contemplation of our own action, of good and evil, is joined with the contemplation of the kindly and the pain-bringing action of God. For our happiness is in fact often dependent on our virtues, our unhappiness on our faults. The Christian looks, however, quite differently on these and on those. The righteous man of the Old Testament could still boast, the Christian may do so no more; he thinks, with fixed purpose, passively even of his virtues,—if he thinks of them at all,—for they, too, come from God. On the other hand, the thought of his own faults will arise precisely in his thanksgiving for happiness: In spite of all my unworthiness Thou, Lord, hast been so gracious; "the goodness of God leadeth thee to repentance" (Rom. 2: 4). If it is only the nobler spirits that comprehend this language of God, already more pious souls are prepared to think in misfortune first of their own shortcoming, whether this has been the immediate cause of that, or whether their sin, though quite apart from it, occurs to them, as it did to the brothers of Joseph in their fear before the stern governor. The old association between evil and sin asserts itself in such connection. If that association is rejected by superficial men in their constant question, How have I merited this? the serious

Christian is ready to say, *Mea culpa.* The finer-tuned spirits among Christians say it also with no such obvious occasion, simply under the pressure of conscience. This confession before God belongs itself to the greatest of mercies. To tell frankly to Him who will retell nothing, who understands us better than the shrewdest priest, that is an incomparable purification of the soul. Yet one should tell Him not only of evil deeds and words, with which confession before men is especially concerned, but one should tell Him, too, that which otherwise does not so readily cross the lips, what evil dispositions, what lack of good dispositions, one marks within.

Such a confession leads still further to prayer no less helpful, which is concerned with our action. Just as we need for the comprehension of our experience a superior Will to which we attribute it that we may give it a meaning, so for our action we often need a Will with which to overcome ourselves, when it is bitter for us to do what conscience bids. To do it for His sake, to make our own in His sight that supreme conception of the significance of all action, that is the grace that lies in such prayer. The mere collecting one's self before God, in order in the sight of His holy countenance to consider what is to be done, gives more repose and unrestraint than in agitated moments our hearts can summon otherwise. Then things emerge clear behind opinions, and duty rises above all the perplexities that fancies and inclinations have awakened. How often from such a chamber of prayer a Christian comes as clear in mind as he left his confessional light at heart! Thus, too, we succeed with the help of God in overcoming ourselves, while before we wished what He does not wish and did not will what He wills. What our conscience and our reason did not attain, obedience to the Lord of life accomplishes. That applies not only to simple and weak men but to the good and keen-minded who in sharp crises of the soul need God as much as those others, for the resistance or the passion

of flesh and blood is alike with all men. In opposition to passions and vices, or in the face of long hard tasks, to pledge one's self by a vow to God is a help and a blessing for every one who wishes to get further than his own weak strength admits. Or, to do as a sacrifice to God, in specific cases, what we would do only for Him and would not do for the sake of ourselves or any other, though it may be only some special act or renunciation, this, too, belongs to the blessings with which God blesses His children, while the wise and the strong perish in their foolishness and their weakness. In such instances one sees that God is no dream but a force, when He strengthens us so that we do what we could not otherwise have done.

Last, in the faithful soul blooms the flower of adoration. If the soul wishes nothing for itself and is paying no debt, if the greatness and the goodness of God simply overwhelm it, then the praise of God ascends to heaven in a song or psalm. We praise God far too little. We accept thoughtlessly the great and the good, we chide at the evil. We neglect too much to praise Him and adore. So it is good, at least when occasion is given us in the church in the beautiful hymns of praise from all ages, to attune our souls to such high accords, which exalt and emancipate us even as they rejoice God in heaven.

4

We have reserved petition in order to grant to other forms of prayer the place that is often denied them, and to reserve the most difficult form for the last. Before we enter on those difficulties the prayer of petition may be described as it predominates in the life of the believer.

On what impulses and convictions does petition rest? In the first place, that fundamental category of all religious life, the sense of God as that supernatural Will which unites in itself power and goodness, must be very strongly marked. Only he who lives in the lasting, vital

conviction that such a Will has in its power all that happens in the world and all that concerns us as well, can come to the point where for him wishes and cares and hopes turn into the prayer: "Lord give!" or "Lord, take!" Where the conception of this Will is held only in the mind or the memory, prayer soon slumbers. So, too, wherever conviction gradually inclines to an idea of a God who has "no elbow-room" the rivulet of prayer is soon dried up. But where that real, religious, fundamental feeling that knows another I above one's own I, compels one to conceive both what happens to and also what is done by this individual I passively, as effects of that greater, omnipotent I, there petition to God can mount from the depths of the soul. That will always happen when there is something of great concern to the believer. Dependence is the foundation of petition in general, but its content is the things for which we care. Few things elude this muster-call to take their place in prayer. In general they will always, when they are missed or threatened or lost, bring the believing soul to prayer to the God who has all in His hands. If the soul of the believer foresees that his own strength will not suffice to win or guard or save them, then, often quite of its own accord, yes, even with no rationalized conviction, the strength of the love for those precious things transforms itself into urgent prayer to the Will that has circumstance and values under its control. Undoubtedly the truest petition is that which comes into being under the impulsion of strong feelings, of a lively sense of those values, of care for them and of dependence on God. "Necessity teaches prayer." Beside this stands the calmer supplication that like a regular morning and evening festal offering is brought on the Lord's day by the assembled community to the Most High. One remembers the duty to pray for all the heart's desire.

It is human nature that our own wishes should take the chief place in petition; from the outset so much really

depends on ourselves that our own need begets a "holy egoism" in our life of prayer which seems blameworthy to very few,—is conceived, rather, as a special token of piety. Beside this, to be sure, there will always be place for others, with whom our own welfare and growth is intimately allied. Naturally the care for others in prayer lifts itself above this egoism, in the same measure as pure love for them avoids the thought of self. Pure, disinterested prayer for another man or for a community or institution probably presents one of the highest reaches of perfection of which we as Christians are capable, at the same time it offers us a foretaste of true felicity.

Manifold, naturally, is the host of wishes which in prayer for ourselves and others become petition. Here is the test of what degree we have attained in our estimation of human things. While most remain clinging in the realm of the earthly goods of sense, because their life and that of others is spent in the grip of those things for which they pray, yet very many raise themselves to those higher goods that we call inner or spiritual. Those belong to the world of things and outward circumstances, these to the world of spirit and inward circumstances. Those circumstances are known to all and need no comment; these call for a brief word. Men call them peace of soul, new thoughts, pure heart, new spirit, love, patience, and whatever else plays a chief part especially in the New Testament and the hymn-book. To them belongs naturally also that strength of which we spoke just now, the strength to bear all hardship that we have to undergo and to do all the hard tasks that we have to accomplish. The aim of the first kind of petition was that something should change in the world of things in favour of ourselves and of those we love, but the aim of this is that we ourselves or those committed to our charge may change. Doubtless both kinds of concern, which we seek to distinguish as for goods and for values,

are most intimately connected. The outward goods are often the postulate of the growth of the inward values, and in the same way these are essential for the maintenance of those, for instance, for the health and well-being of individuals and especially of communities. This will be of import for us when we come to consider whether we must exclude the former from our sphere and regard the latter only.

It is indeed a relief to turn one's wishes and cares into petitions, but it would be an excessive diffidence to be content with that alone. No one who asks is indifferent to the question whether he is to receive. How is it with that? Often enough surely the faithful petitioner finds that he does receive what he has asked. How comes that? Yesterday he prayed, and today or tomorrow or even later it happens in the course of events that that very thing occurs and presents itself to him. He recovers, or some work succeeds, or some danger is warded off, or the prodigal son returns to his father. Then asking and receiving blend into a concord which belongs to the most felicitous experiences. Expressed more soberly: The petitioner draws as it were a line to join his prayer with the event, while he connects them both with the concept of the good and mighty God. The naïve believer, because this concept of God is for him the most living part of all reality, receives the proffered good from his Father's hands and thanks Him as he would thank a man whom he saw bodily before him. He expresses himself somewhat thus: God has given me my health again. That is a sentence in which the good besought forms the object, the invisible divine Will the subject and a verb of causation or decision the copula. Naturally it happens much oftener, as we all, alas, know, that what we ask does not come at our prayer. Then, unperplexed, the righteous man expresses this, too, personally and passively: God has not answered my prayer but has denied the fulfilment of my wish. God remains still the subject

and the I dependent on Him. But the righteous man, if he has had experience in these things, will then look further to see if God has not something more to say and to offer to him than just that No. Then, as a rule, he will find a point that presents a good, precious for him, which he receives as a gift from God's hand in compensation for that which he had asked and God had denied. Thus faith is ever busied drawing lines and here, too, connecting some third thing with the prayer and the concept of God. For faith cannot endure if it cannot seek meaning in life, and at least surmise and believe a meaning, though it may not discover it. The impulse of that religious fundamental feeling, the assurance of the supernatural Guide of life and the world, is so strong that it will assert itself over and over, and lead to special interpretations of life, such as in these connections exist between things apparently far estranged. This is one of the great advantages which the life of faith has above every other life. Through this interpretation of all experiences and tasks by means of the thought of God unity comes into life, and with it strength and peace. And what could there be more precious than strength and peace?

5

But when we come to draw these lines that connect single points in the world of incident with our wishes that have become prayers, shall we not find the field of incident already occupied? I mean, filled with lines of quite another sort, connecting single points in that world of incident. We name them causal connections. We draw, for instance, a line between sundown and dark, between taking poison and illness or death, between sowing and reaping, command and obedience, temptation and sin, education and improvement. These lines signify that we reckon with connections between the things we join, and order our work, together with our

expectation, accordingly. What sense has it then to inject our prayers into this network of lines or to add to these causal lines yet others which introduce still another cause and so confuse the whole structure? It might appear this way: Either what is to happen will happen any way; what need have we then to pray? or: What cannot happen, will not; how then may we pray for it? With these two statements we reach two conceptions that seem to exclude prayer, necessity and impossibility. These two conceptions have this relation to one another: Whatever is necessary, its absence or its opposite is impossible. If it is necessary that the sun should set at a fixed evening hour, then it can shine no longer or even omit to set. If it is impossible that a man should continue to keep on living on earth, the converse of that necessity is that he dies. Obviously, actual cases of this sort make prayer in the nature of things impossible. No one will seriously pray that the sun may rise tomorrow for it will do so automatically; we count its failure to appear impossible. No one will pray that he or anybody else may live forever, for we count that impossible because we count death necessary. There are then really things that are so sure to happen that we can add to our determination of their occurrence the judgment that they happen always of necessity. But how is it with the other things? Whoever has tuberculosis, must he die? Assuredly, but what do we know of the When or the How? If a father or his son go to the war, must he fall? must he return safe and sound? If we educate someone, must he turn out well? Must everyone fall into temptation? Or where is the necessity that a people should always maintain itself at its height? Where the necessity that another people be conquered? In other words the sphere of the necessary, whose opposite is the impossible, seems not to be so wide that the life of prayer need be stifled. Is not it like this? Just as there have been and are actual

cases of answer to prayer, so there are, also, certain cases in the world of incident where no one expects answer to a prayer that asks anything else than that the necessary happen. But, just as pious groups have concluded from those single cases of answer that to prayer all things are possible, so there are irreligious groups which conclude from these necessary occurrences that everything is necessary and nothing feasible. We see, prayer lives on the feasible and our task is to make place for it by setting bounds to the necessary and the unfeasible.

To that end the first step is this: The word "necessary" is a word that issues from our mind as a judgment about incident in addition to the establishment of the fact of the incident. It is then, so soon as it extends beyond those simplest cases that are generally recognized as necessary, not the expression of knowledge but of general observation. It is the effect of a conception of the world or of a faith. It is already something gained to recognize that here it is not knowledge and belief that are in opposition but belief and belief. Let us get a little closer to the question. Even the adherents of this belief in the necessity of incident do not undertake in each separate case to say, when anything happens, how it happens or that it has any source at all. Everyday life and the great course of the world are constantly proving to us what men express in the somewhat bitter jesting phrase: "It's the unexpected that happens." The shrewd man long ago left prophecies and anticipations to people who pretend to know all because they do not know the simplest thing. We can foresee with assurance only in the sphere of astronomy and a large part of the rest of happenings in nature. So soon as organic incident comes in question uncertainty enters into the matter. If, however, the processes in this sphere get somewhat complex, then every wise physician and naturalist checks himself and leaves prophecy to half-culture. Peculiarly will one be

very cautious in judgment when he is dealing with things in which living beings, especially men, have part, and, above all, in dealing with human actions. If we have to do with the more complex psychic processes, or with things that are to be discussed and undertaken by a community of men—everybody knows that that is just when the unexpected does happen. Thus we have to thank our very ignorance for the wide scope it gives to feasibilities and to prayers.

But be sure we shall hear the objection: If indeed there are many cases where we do not know what must come and what cannot come, we do know that the state of the world is such that what comes must come, and that what does not come could not come. Limitation of our knowledge carries no implication about the facts. But skepticism, of which Hume may stand as representative, has thoroughly uprooted this belief. Little as one can accomplish with such a disposition of mind, one can use it excellently for relief against such coercion as would confine us in necessity. Suppose we know nothing. We know, at least, that there are men worth hearing today who say something quite different from what we used to hear in our mechanically and materialistically fashioned schooldays. For these that old theory is done away, according to which each new condition is only a transformation of its predecessor, so that one could express all successive conditions by comparisons. In its place investigators like Bergson and Hans Driesch are actually postulating the possibility that there is a truly New. And indeed there is a New not alone in the sphere of man's intellectual life but also in nature. Neither the history of man nor even that of nature unfolds as the development of a necessary process from a germ which involves all, but there is a New. Yet does not this, too, develop itself according to law? What then is law? Is not the usual connotation that one associates with this word a renewal of the old myth according to which the gods, and the *ananke*

above them, governed the world by a brazen coercion? Is law more than the observation that some processes follow on others, an observation which serves until it is replaced by some other, better and more precise? Besides, even with laws we are not merely dealing with ever new and better knowledge of conditions that are ever unchanged. An investigator like Hans Driesch does not hesitate to recognize that the very system of such laws might itself change in the mid course of natural history, for instance, at the transition from reptiles to mammals, this too, naturally, according to law, somewhat as in a State the transition comes legally from absolute to constitutional government. Thus laws may be legally changed or even rescinded. Therefore, on these two grounds, which apply alike to knowledge of incident and incident itself, the concept "impossible" is itself "impossible." In short, only that has value that has actually happened and actually exists. On that we can exercise our wits and to it apply our categories. What actually has been is surely possible and perhaps also necessary, but to call anything possible or impossible or necessary without confirmation through actuality,—the courage for that we shall hardly muster again today.

6

Thus we are free to choose between theories that make necessity a general law of the world, and those that do not. That is true in both realms, that of the lower goods and of the higher values. We may not suppose that in the sphere of psychic life a greater freedom rules than in the material. What does our Lord say about the possibility that a rich man may enter the Kingdom compared with the possibility that a camel may go through a needle's eye? But, still, as Christians we make a positive use of our lack of knowledge in this whole sphere when we pray, because that praying is for us an inner necessity. To be sure we must not promise ourselves all too much from this freedom which our ignorance concedes us. Prayer

is no wizard's wand by which we can snatch what we wish. We must say that over and over, whether the *plebs credentium* and those who speak for them like to hear it or not. Really we know nothing at all about what effect prayer has on God, since for all we know about prayer and its effects we are referred exclusively to our own experience of prayer. Yet we do know that there are in the world arrangements and connections. We know that periods of time and developments are needed to let things mature, and that other things simply cannot be, long for them as we will. We learn that it goes against the majesty of God if we urge that He should comply with our wishes when it suits us to wish to change things. We may pray but, equally, He may deny Himself to us. We have our will but He has also His will; and verily His is mightier than ours. That is manifest to us in the history of our own praying, which with most Christians is in general the same.

We have all begun by asking Him for things for which we cared as conditions of our external life. To that there is no objection; we may still do it and teach our children so. Only such prayer must hold fast to these conditions: We must not forget that He is the eternal God with whom we speak, who permits us to bring all before Him but reserves to Himself to grant us what He will; also, we must ask Him for nothing wrong, that is, for nothing for which our conscience would forbid us to give thanks, but only for things that stand in close connection with spiritual values; and finally we must pray only for things to attain which we are ready to set our whole strength to work, as though all prayer were of no avail. As was said above, much of what we asked will then be awarded us, and it is right to follow those Christians who let themselves be guarded by prayer from the vain thought that they owe what they asked to themselves. Luther says that very finely in his comment on the fourth petition of the Lord's Prayer: "God gives daily bread also,

without prayer of ours, to all wicked men, but we pray that He may let us realize it and that we may receive our daily bread with thanksgiving." The essential thing, then, is the recognition and the thanks. For the quite frequent case when we are not answered the best guide is our Lord and His apostle Paul. Jesus in Gethsemane lifted Himself by prayer up from the "If it be possible" to the If it may not, "Thy will be done" (Matth. 26: 39–42). And Paul prayed thrice that God might take the thorn from the flesh. But he was told: "My grace is sufficient for thee, for My strength is made perfect in weakness" (II Cor. 12: 9). At that moment he knew that that thorn was meant to restrain him from over-glorying in the great revelations that had been granted him. If the prayer of the believer have not the power to prevail with God to change things, then the believer, in bitter wrestling in prayer, must conform himself to God, that he may himself change. By our unheard prayers God bids us reconcile ourselves to His will, which we are to honour though we do not comprehend. God sets His will above our will. That is often harder than it is to confess with the lips that it is wholesome. Or, we learn to recognize something else as God's gift and to see in it compensation for what is denied. We lost asses and God offered us a kingdom. We may not always claim in addition the fortune of Saul, to get the asses as well. Further, by unanswered prayers God shows us the good we already have. So with the unanswered prayers God has blessed His children more than with the answered, for by them he is ever resubduing their wills, which, because they count themselves God's favourites, is often just what they need quite as much as they dislike it. By unanswered prayers He guides them, at first sorely against their wills, in their sense of values, but with a gradual transformation of motives, up far above their former position into the divine and eternal, so that they no longer wish to subordinate God to themselves, but themselves

to Him, so that they no longer desire mere daily bread in every sort of good, but seek above all His kingdom and a soul full of peace for themselves and for all. Many a man has besought God for a loaf on which his heart hung. God denied it and presently he saw that it was only a stone. Many a man has sought escape from a stone that God forced into his hand or even into his mouth, and, lo, presently he found that it was nourishing bread. Thus God, just by not answering us, leads us slowly up to the height of His wishes and His thoughts. Finally, by such unanswered desires He wishes to call us to work. We have prayed, earnestly or thoughtlessly, but we have not lifted a finger. We have prayed for the peace of the world, but ourselves have been quarreling; for our health, but have made ourselves sick; for a pure heart, but with evil stinging words toward others have been ever making ourselves unclean again. Then God, when He does not answer our prayer, means to say to us: "You go and do it yourself." Then we grow serious. For we are serious then only when our striving for those goods is so strong that just as many a mountain sheds two streams that on differing courses hasten to the sea, so our striving gushes in warm prayer to heaven yet stirs none the less our thoughts and hands to action.

May we by our prayers ever raise ourselves more and more above ourselves until at last we pray God only for His will. The holiest spirits have always closed the story of their life of prayer by praying this only: "Thy will be done." God becomes for us so great, so mighty, His heart seems so full of goodness, His mind so full of wisdom, that, as we think of these, our judgment and our wishing are silenced, and we are ready to leave wholly to Him whatever He wills to give. Then petition recedes and the other contents of prayer come to the front, thanksgiving, resignation, confession, sacrifice, praise, worship. And, at last, even the earlier of these forms are lost in the praise and in the worship: *Soli Deo gloria.*

The Holy Eucharist

By J. T. F. Farquhar, M.A.,
Rector of the Episcopal Church, Fochabers, Scotland.

When a new thing receives as its name a word taken from the common speech of the people we may be sure that the word chosen describes some vital or some prominent feature of the thing to which it is applied. It is however difficult to imagine that, were our central Christian Service to be renamed today, the old names having been forgotten, it would once more be termed the Holy Eucharist. But that that is no label name, and that we may rightly infer from it a feature of the Service that was both vital and prominent, it is the object of this study to recall to memory.

From the ordinary lexicons we learn that it means either thankfulness itself or an expression of it, such expression being apparently regarded as simply verbal. But it is clear that in the time of our Lord other forms of expression were beginning to be recognized as covered by the term. Thus Philo[1] speaks of the victim itself in the morning and evening oblation as a εὐχαριστία. That it is clearly a thankoffering, and not an offering in general, that he means appears clearly from his further expression αἱ διὰ θυσιῶν εὐχαριστίαι, and from his description of the oblation as being ὑπὲρ εὐχαριστίας.

It is worthy also of notice that while the word is unknown to the LXX in all senses a tendency was manifest about the beginning of the Christian era to use it as a substitute for αἴνεσις, a word of recognized liturgical use. After the examination of that and of some kindred

[1] *Journal of Theological Studies*, July, 1902. p. 504.

evidence Dr. Hort concludes that in Christian usage the word has two concrete senses,—(1) a thanksgiving in words, and (2) a thanksgiving in offerings. He adds that in early times it always appears to denote the thing offered, and not the ceremony or service or the institution. But even in cases where the *thing offered* is immediately the material element of the sacrifice, that statement does not always hold; and the speaker may distinctly have in his mind the whole service. And, as Dr. Hort recognizes, we must not in fact limit the sense of the term in that way. In the earliest days of the Christian Church the true sense of *eucharist* was never forgotten and its immediate sense is often the verbal thanksgiving. Indeed how else than by a verbal thanksgiving could the material element become a thankoffering? And further, in general where we find the word used in connection with the Christian Service, the true remark to make is not that the speaker was consciously isolating a single element in it, but that the aspect of thanksgiving was so prominent to his view that when he spoke of the Eucharist he spoke of the whole Service, even if eucharist were yet very far from being a definite and technical liturgical term.

As bearing on Dr. Hort's point, but still more as illustrating directly for our main purpose the use of the word *eucharist* and its effective synonym *ainesis*, let us take a few examples. St. Paul then speaks of "saying Amen to thy eucharist". And in the Epistle to the Hebrews we read in a passage written undoubtedly with the Christian Service in mind, "Through Him let us offer a sacrifice of *ainesis* . . . that is the fruit of our lips".

In both those cases the verbal aspect of the word is clearly uppermost, but the latter is also a first step in the direction of Philo's use. Again, in the Didache, we find the phrase, "Concerning the Eucharist", followed by what are evidently meant to be the important directions for the whole Service including the Reception.

Next we may notice, also in the Didache, "Let no one eat or drink of your Eucharist except, etc." And in St. Ignatius,[2] "Because they do not confess the Eucharist to be the flesh of our Saviour".

In both of those passages we have come closer, very close indeed, to the use of the word in the simple meaning of the material Sacrifice. But in the former we have to notice that the personal pronoun shows that it is not yet a distinctly technical term in which the sense of thankfulness has become obliterated or obscured. And also the point of the observation is to debar from the act of personal communion those who have no part or lot in the whole eucharistic service. And in the latter the author's language is characteristically symbolical. Who without reading for himself the whole passage would imagine that it has nothing to do with the relation between the elements and our Lord's Body? But the fact is so. The passage refers to the docetic heresy; and the true sense would be obtained by understanding Eucharist as meaning effectively the cause or subject of the thanksgiving, that is, our Lord Himself, rather than its expression or vehicle, that is, the material elements.

It is only in Justin that we first find a clear example of the restricted, non-symbolic, application of the term to the material elements. He writes "This food we call Eucharist". And yet he himself always uses the expressions *the Bread of the Eucharist*, or *the Bread* εὐχαριστηθείς.

And we may remember here St. Paul's expression, "the cup of blessing". For as appears from a comparison of the various accounts of the Institution, *eulogia* and *eucharist* were interchangeable terms. The third cup at the Passover was especially known by that name.

It is probable then that in the Christian Church the verbal application of *Eucharist* as used in connection with our Lord's Service preceded the material. It is certain that its true sense of thankfulness was not ob-

[2] *Smyrn.* vi.

scured for a long time, and that the verbal thanksgiving was in any case the obvious consecration prayer of the elements. And there is nothing to make us reject the natural inference when we find that among Greek-speaking peoples *Eucharist* was pre-eminently the name connected with the Memorial Service of Christ.

We must be prepared to find that spiritually and liturgically the idea of thankfulness should take the chief part in that which man is called on to do in Christ's Memorial.

Let us then examine with that in view (1) the narratives of the institution and (2) the testimony as to the form and spirit of the Service to be found in the writers of the primitive age. The force of anything that is shown to be a real part of the service from the narrative of the institution can of course be neither increased nor diminished by later usage. But later testimony may well be used in throwing back light on the true meaning of the original narrative.

To that end also we must recall some points in the environment of the institution, and they will help us also to appreciate what is told us as to the subsequent development of the service.

In particular we must notice the ceremony of Kiddush[3] in which God is blessed, over the breaking of a cake and a poured out cup of wine, as the Creator of the world and the Giver of bread and wine by which life is sustained. Kiddush was, and indeed still is, celebrated in every Jewish household in the opening hour of the Sabbath, or as soon as the master returns from the worship of the synagogue. The first words of the thanksgiving are identical with those of the blessing of God customary before all meals, and in its development the Sabbath is regarded as a memorial of creation and as being honourable above all holy convocations by the memory of the deliverance from Egypt.

[3] *Religion and Worship of the Synagogue* (Pitman & Sons) pp. 333, 346.

It is celebrated also on many other solemn religious occasions, the blessings being varied to suit the special character of the day. They always begin however with the regular formula already referred to. Thus we find Kiddush incorporated with the Passover, with this expansion, that there are four ceremonial cups distributed throughout the meal. The first of these, associated as it is with the broken cake and standing as an introduction to the whole service is naturally regarded as being in a special sense the cup of the Kiddush, but the unity of idea in other respects is obvious and they are all introduced by the regular formula. At the first cup special mention is made of the gift of life, and of the election of Israel; at the second of the deliverance from Egypt; the third, the "cup of blessing", and the fourth accompanied by a remarkable outburst of praise come together at the very close of the supper.[4] That those were substantially the customs of our Lord's age is sufficiently obvious from the fact that the New Testament narratives would be unintelligible on any other supposition. But it is known also that Kiddush was ancient in the days of Hillel and Shammai, for these two disputed as to the right order of the service. And again the traditional interpretation of the opening words of the Fourth Commandment was to understand them as an injunction to celebrate the Sabbath Kiddush.

The accounts of the institution of the Holy Communion were written by men and for men familiar with the ritual of the Passover and of Kiddush. When then we read uniformly that our Lord "thanked" or "blessed" as He took the bread and the cup, and find uniformly that no account is given of the words that He used, we may be sure of two things: first, that the thanksgiving is an important

[4] I cannot now verify my words, but my memory tells me, what is sufficiently probable on the face of it, that Bartolocci (vol. ii, p. 736, seqq.) speaks of the fourth cup as being in his day merely permissible. In our Lord's day the supper may well have been closed by a single cup.

part of the rite that He was ordaining; and secondly, that His words did not differ substantially from the familiar forms. He uttered then the normal thanksgivings, but He added to them by saying, "This is My Body", "This is My Blood" and "Do this in remembrance of Me". So a new meaning was given to the old words. Our thanksgiving was no longer to be merely for our bodily life and for the meat that perisheth, but for everlasting life and the food that nourisheth thereto. Our memorial was no longer to be of the mere deliverance from the slavery of Egypt, but rather of Him Who died and rose again from the dead that we might be free from sin and from all evil. The "this" then that our Lord appointed as our service contained that new and glorious thanksgiving as a pre-eminent feature on a level of importance reached only by one other, the reception of the elements. Those two and only those two are clearly mentioned in the narrative, for thanksgiving includes the memorial of its cause.

That conclusion is quite independent of any recognized connection between the Passover and the weekly service as such, but we have seen at the same time that the Christian service was formed of the same liturgical elements as the Jewish Kiddush, and even, so far as the narrative of institution shows, that it did not merely contain elements taken from Kiddush, but was in liturgical framework Kiddush itself glorified to a Christian use.[5] At any rate that it was so regarded in the first age will appear from the following considerations.

The only indication of the frequency of celebration contemplated by our Lord is contained in the word "this", expanded in one place by the phrase "as oft as ye shall drink it". If the ritual pointed at by those words be that of Kiddush, then a weekly celebration as the nor-

[5] If it be permissible to refer to an article which I have never had the privilege of seeing, I would refer here to one on this subject to be found in the *Journal of Theological Studies*, 1902, ii, 357, by G. H. Box, who, as one of the authors of *The Religion and Worship of the Synagogue*, is competent to throw full light on the whole of this matter.

mal rule with special celebrations added on great occasions will be adopted. While, if Kiddush be not pointed at, then any temporal reference must be to the annual feast of the Passover. Or if we go so far as to deny all temporal reference, then what is to explain the fact that a ritual instituted at an annual festival and founded on its customs became straightaway a weekly service unless the customs appropriated were also of weekly celebration? Naturally it would be celebrated, not on the Sabbath, but at the gathering on the Lord's Day, and was no doubt the means whereby Sunday became a day of universal Christian observance. Indeed, when Ignatius uses the phrase "to observe the Sabbath" to distinguish the Jews from the Christians, it is tempting to believe that he had in his mind the difference between the hallowing of the Sabbath and the hallowing of the Lord's Day, that is, between Kiddush and the Holy Eucharist.

The close connection between the two services explains also how the Eucharist came to be transferred from an evening to a morning hour. In Jewish communities one day ended and the next began at sunset, so those who were Christian would hallow the Lord's Day at the same hour as their brethren hallowed the Sabbath. But among Gentiles where the day began at midnight the hallowing would take place as early in the morning as might be.

Again, as leavened bread was the normal rule for Kiddush, so it would be for the Eucharist. Otherwise the unleavened bread used at the institution would surely have been retained. But in spite of St. Paul's striking appeal to keep the feast with the unleavened bread of sincerity and truth there is no trace for centuries that unleavened bread was ever used as essentially the proper element at the feast of the Eucharist.

With what strictness at the very first the meeting of the Church was regarded as the meeting of the Christian family where alone the Christian Kiddush might be celebrated with propriety, it is impossible to say. The pas-

sage in Acts (2:46) simply contrasts the Jewish Temple worship with the Christian worship held more privately, and throws no light on the matter. But the urgency with which Ignatius insists upon the evil of irregular celebrations seems to point to a certain tradition of looser custom in the Church as well as to the action of deliberate schismatics. But that is by the way.

We have called the Eucharist the Christian Kiddush. That there is no temerity in doing so will appear finally from the fact that Kuddasha, Keddase, and Kuddas are respectively the Nestorian, the Ethiopic, and the Syrian terms for the Liturgy and in particular for the Anaphora.[6] Whatsoever the immediate point of view may have been that led men to give the name of the old Jewish to the new Christian service, we are once more led to the clear conclusion that in form and use the two services were very like each other. And if we are not taught afresh by the mere name in what that likeness consisted we are afforded strong corroboration of the evidence that has exhibited not only the fact but the manner also of that likeness. The prominent feature of the Eucharist must have been the blessing in thankfulness of the Holy Name.

We now take up the Didache, a writing much esteemed in ancient days, and indubitably the earliest that has been preserved for us.[7] At any rate the picture of Church life which it presents is of a less developed type than any that we find elsewhere. It has moreover all the appearance of being, not an original composition, but a compilation from existing sources whether oral or written, and so a valuable witness to contemporary and to antecedent practice.

It gives directions for the performance of various Church acts, and among them for the Holy Eucharist. The late Bishop of Salisbury[8] would have us reject the

[6] Brightman's *Eastern Liturgies.*

[7] *v.* Dr. Wünsche's preface in Schulze's edition, 1884.

[8] *Holy Communion* (Longmans Green & Co.), p. 60. On one occasion I submitted the substance of the above pages to his notice.

plain statement of the Didache in what seems to be its only possible interpretation and refer the prayers given to something else. But of the four reasons which he gives the strongest seems to be that "they are wholly dissimilar from any consecration prayers that have come down to us". They are certainly dissimilar from those portions of the developed Liturgies which, centuries later, were recognized as central and vital.

But if any one will keep in mind the facts that have already been noticed here and will regard those that are yet to be reviewed, he will feel that the argument is all the other way. The Didache supplies the very forms which the circumjacent evidence would have compelled us to postulate as the nucleus of the Catholic Liturgies had the Didache itself not been providentially restored to us to bear its own independent and objective witness.[9] To this witness then we confidently appeal. Familiar as the Eucharistic passage may be, it is too important not to reproduce it here.

"Concerning the Eucharist. Make your Eucharist thus,—First for the Cup. Our Father, We make our Eucharist to Thee for the Holy Vine of David Thy servant, which Thou hast revealed to us through Jesus Thy servant. Glory be to Thee for ever. And for the broken bread,—Our Father, we make our Eucharist to Thee for life and knowledge which Thou hast unveiled for us through Jesus Thy servant. Glory be to Thee for ever. As this broken bread was scattered upon the hill and was gathered into one, so let Thy Church be gathered into Thy kingdom from the ends of the earth. For Thine is the glory and the power through Jesus Christ for ever."

In a prayer to be said after reception we find the parallel and the distance between the Christian Eucharist and

---

Among other things he said, "I have recently been looking up the passages in the Didache and am still puzzled by them." On rereading his letter I am confirmed in my first impression that his difficulties were subjective, that is, that he could not contemplate a Thanksgiving as the centre of the Liturgy. He was able to admit a "Christian Eucharist of a very simple character possibly with only the Lord's Prayer".

[9] When some twenty years ago I first saw the Didache I felt as a follower of Darwin might have felt, had he unexpectedly met the Missing Link.

the Jewish Kiddush set forth with absolute distinctness in these words,—

> "Thou Almighty Lord didst create all things for Thy Name's sake, and Thou gavest food and drink to man for his enjoyment that he might make his eucharist to Thee. But to us Thou hast granted spiritual food and drink, and eternal life."

No commentator today upon the account of the Institution could find better words than those.

We may notice that in making the Cup precede the Bread the Didache reverts to the order of the weekly Kiddush. Possibly those who inherited the service as a living tradition independent of the written narratives regarded the order adopted by our Lord in somewhat the same light as they regarded the fact that in our Lord's hands the bread was unleavened, that is, as an unimportant accident of the Passover season.

The forms given are very short. Indeed the greater part has been reproduced above. But these were probably to be regarded as a nucleus and a suggestion ensuring the essential point. In fact an express direction is given that the prophets should be permitted εὐχαριστεῖν ὅσα θέλουσιν. There is also a direction that none should be permitted to partake except the baptized, "for the Lord said, give not that which is holy to the dogs".

With regard to the all important point of the Thanksgiving we may now leave the Didache without further words to take its own place in the harmonious development of the Liturgy. But we may notice in parting from it that, short as its sentences are, they contain striking harmonies in other matters also with subsequent liturgical literature. Even as late as Justin the celebrant prayed ὅση δύναμις αὐτῷ.[10] In Justin too we find the exclusion of the unbaptized and that too in terms that might well be a paraphrase of the language of the Didache framed to please as well as to instruct the ears of those termed dogs by the latter.[11] In Bishop Sarapion's Liturgy we

[10] *Apologia* c. 67. [11] *Apologia* c. 66.

find the very sentence that speaks of the bread that was scattered upon the hills.

And finally in this parenthesis we may notice that the liturgical form, as it is with great propriety supposed to be, which we find in Clement of Rome[12] would not only in substance be a most harmonious enlargement of the service of the Didache, but also in its very language recalls its phrases. Clement does not supply us with much that bears more directly upon the centre of the matter. Only in a passage which manifestly treats of the celebration of the Eucharist he speaks of the gradations of ecclesiastical honour and adds "Let each of us, my brethren, offer his Eucharist (εὐχαριστείτω Θεῷ) in his own rank".[13] Now at that date,[14] as the word eucharist, so *a fortiori* its cognates were more than mere label names and technical terms even when applied to our Lord's Service, so we learn at least that to Clement the prominent feature of the celebrant's as of the layman's part therein consisted in thanksgiving. And he gives us nothing to present the Liturgy under any other aspect.

Other primitive writers would simply illustrate the argument already based on the actual name itself, the Eucharist, and so we may pass on with this one remark. As far as positive evidence goes the thanksgiving with suitable supplicatory expansion was not only the central part of the words of the Liturgy, but the whole of it.

We come now to Justin Martyr. His evidence is not only copious but is also of unique weight through the extent of his travels, and his intimate knowledge of Rome, at that time the meeting-place of the world. It is altogether harmonious with what is written above, even with the immediately preceding remark.

[12] cc. LIX, LX. [13] c. XLI.

[14] Pearson places the epistle before the destruction of the Temple, Lightfoot at the close of the century. A careful study has led myself to believe that it was written early in the eighth decade. v. *Visible Church* (D. Wyllie & Son, Aberdeen), p. 113.

Dr. Watterich,[15] indeed, thinks that the existence of the Invocation may be deduced from a certain phrase based on I Timothy 1:5, and no doubt, were we assured on other grounds that Justin was familiar with the Invocation, it would be quite permissible to see a reference to it in the words in question. But there are several possible interpretations of which Watterich's is by no means the most natural, so it would be rash to make the words carry the weight of proof that he would put upon them. Hence, though this detail is unimportant for the substance of our contention, we must hold that the witness of Justin is in fact *wholly* of the same nature as that which has gone before.

As an example of Justin's general attitude, we may quote what he says in reply to a charge of atheism founded on the fact that the Christians worshipped without sacrifice, libations, or incense. For the sake of brevity we paraphrase rather than translate: "In truth we do worship only by the word of prayer and thanksgiving, counting it the only true way of honouring God to offer His gifts to ourselves and to the poor and not to destroy them with fire, and in thankfulness to praise Him by word for all His benefits both as to our earthly and our heavenly lives.[16] The closing words there evidently refer to the Eucharist, and as a more precise description we may take this,—

"Bread is brought and wine and water, and the president offers prayers and thanksgivings according to his ability. The people assent by the Amen. And the distribution and reception of the elements over which thanksgiving has been made takes place." [17]

[15] *Konsekrationsmoment* (Carl Winter, Heidelberg), p. 37. Let me here once for all admit my indebtedness to that book for an invaluable catena of Eucharistic passages. I cannot follow the author in the use he makes of them.

[16] *Apol.* c. 13.

[17] *Apol.* 67. I translate τῶν εὐχαριστηθέντων as above, following the "*in quo gratiae actae sint*" of the Latin translator of Irenaeus which can only represent the same Greek phrase. Possibly *whereby* should stand in place of *over which*. Compare also II Corin. 1:11. Other passages in Justin important for the main matter are the immediately preceding chapters 65, 66, and *Dial.* 41, 70, 117.

A distinct Invocation had probably not appeared as yet in the Liturgy. But it is unthinkable that the "president" of the Eucharist should not have offered supplication in more or less sacramental terms that those who joined in the Communion might receive effectively the food of eternal life. And that this prayer was actually the origin of the recognized Invocation appears probable not only from the nature of the case, and from its actual position in the Liturgy, but also from the fact that an integral part of it has always been a prayer in one form or another that the communicant should be forgiven and preserved into life eternal.

Irenaeus places it beyond doubt that in his time an Invocation of one sort or another was already recognized in the Liturgy. For he speaks[18] of earthly bread receiving the call of God and thereby becoming the Eucharist and so nourishing our bodies to everlasting life. To the same effect he speaks in another place, saying,—

"When therefore the mixed cup and the manufactured bread receive the Word of God, they become the Eucharist of the Body and Blood of Christ from which the substance of our own flesh is increased, and of which it consists." [19]

The reference to the reception of the Word of God, especially in the light of the preceding passage can mean nothing else than that Irenaeus was familiar with an Invocation of the Logos. But he has not forgotten the importance of the Thanksgiving. And indeed it is not easy to regard his language over all as quite consistent with itself. We can explain it only by the supposition that his beliefs and theories have developed in certain directions while he has retained faithfully and without question the traditional practice of the Church, and in particular that in his mind the Invocation was not connected with the Sacrifice of the Eucharist but solely with the Reception, and so also was addressed to the Logos as the living principle of nature.

[18] Adv. Haer: iv, 34. [19] Adv. Haer: v, 1.

Thus in the passage in which he speaks of the elements receiving the call of God he speaks at length also of the "oblation of the Church which the Lord taught us to offer throughout the whole world". A few sentences taken at intervals will correctly show its import.

"Therefore we must offer to God the first fruits. . . There are sacrifices among the Gentiles, and there are sacrifices in the Church. But it is the outside appearance only that is unchanged, for it is now offered by freemen and not by slaves. . . Therefore it is not his sacrifice that makes the man holy, for God needs no sacrifice, but the conscience of him who offers. . . And this oblation the Church alone offers pure to the Creator, for it offers it from His own creation with thanksgiving. [As for the heretics] they sin against their Father doing dishonour to Him rather than offering thanksgiving. For how shall it be established for them that that bread over which thanksgiving has been made is the Body of their Lord, and that the cup is of His Blood if they do not confess Himself to be the Word of God through Which trees bear fruit", etc.

The absence of remark with which Irenaeus makes the parallel between the Gentile and the Christian oblation may suggest that the transcendent liturgical importance of the mention of the Incarnation in the words of thanksgiving was not present to his mind, but his words leave no doubt but that the distinctive feature of the Oblation appointed by Christ was still in fact the Thanksgiving.

Some accuse his Latin translator for being behind his age in rendering εὐχαριστηθείς by *in quo gratiae actae sint*, but without reason. For even if we prefer the phrase *made eucharist*, the effective meaning will be the same. That will follow from the whole drift of our investigation. But we may further call attention to the language Irenaeus uses in speaking of the mock eucharists of the heretic Marcus. Marcus himself is pictured as "offering thanks and making a long speech of invocation". His female disciples however in a curious ceremony simply "offer thanks" over the cup, and yet Irenaeus describes the liquid as having thereby been made eucharist, *factus eucharistia.*

In Pfaff's Irenaean fragment[20] we find the following

[20] *Konsekrationsmoment*, pp. 57, 246.

words which, be they of the same Irenaeus or not, certainly reflect his standpoint most accurately with the exception that they speak of the Spirit where he probably would have spoken of the Logos. But they will be all the more striking if they be of a slightly later date, for they are no modern forgery.

"Wherefore the offering of the Eucharist is not fleshy but spiritual, and therein pure. For we offer to God the bread and cup of the blessing, giving Him thanks that He has commanded the earth to grow these fruits for our nourishment. Then *having finished the offering* we call upon the Holy Spirit that He may appoint this sacrifice, the bread to be the Body of Christ and the cup to be His Blood that they who partake of these anti-types may obtain remission of sins and life everlasting."

We see then that even as late as the time of Irenaeus the Invocation while it was now established as a portion of the Liturgy was not part of, or necessary for, the Eucharistic Oblation, but an addition to it for the purpose of leaving nothing undone towards the securing for the communicants the gifts of forgiveness and of eternal life. Even James of Edessa shows traces of the same point of view for he tells us that the "whole kurobho (anaphora) is that we should commemorate and declare the things which Christ wrought in our behalf".[21] Certainly his language cannot be very precise for in another place, after mention of the Invocation and Commemorations, he says that then the celebrant "finishes the kurobho". But the former sentence stands, and in it he is looking beyond liturgical forms to the important realities.

We need not have gone below Justin to assure ourselves that the Thanksgiving has been present universally in the Catholic Liturgy. But the later testimonies are valuable as showing how first it began to lose its pre-eminence in the general estimation. We see that the liturgical conditions and valuations of later days were an easy, if scarcely legitimate, development from those of the primitive age. And thus these later conditions have nothing in them to

[21] Brightman, p. 492.

make us suspicious as to the interpretation of our surely in any case unambiguous witnesses. We have witnessed the rise of the Invocation. The Account of the Institution must have come in at a very early date both in response to the most elementary call of edification and also liturgically to constitute the action as Christ's appointed service. The true place and meaning of the Thanksgiving were easily obscured among those to whom the simple spiritual milk of primitive days seemed unsatisfying, and especially when they had forgotten, and at first sight would have been shocked by, the thought of the close historical connection between the Christian Eucharist and the weekly service of the hostile Jews.

One more easy step after those already taken by the time of Irenaeus, and the Invocation will have taken the chief place in general estimation as the focus of the Liturgy. That step was certainly taken by the middle of the fourth century, and with an interesting piece of evidence on that point we may close our investigation.

In the Sahidic Ecclesiastical Canons, according to Dr. Brightman, chapters 31–62 belong to an unknown but very early date, while chapters 63–79 belong to the date mentioned just above. The earlier portion gives directions for the conduct of the Mass at the consecration of a bishop. The celebrant is directed to lay his hand upon the oblation with the presbyters and to make a thanksgiving. Then after some versicles and responses the text runs,—

"Let him say again, *Let us give thanks unto the Lord.* Let the people say, *It is right and just.* And let him pray in like sort saying what follows after these things according to the custom of the Holy Oblation."

And that is all. The same portion of the canons gives also directions for Mass at a baptism, and the only part that concerns our present enquiry is in these terms,—

"He shall give thanks over a loaf because it is the symbol of the Flesh of Christ and over a chalice of wine because it is the Blood of Christ."

In both these cases the service in the Sahidic rule is as void of features other than the thanksgiving as it is in the Didache itself. And the point of view of the two documents is identical.

But now let us look at directions for a Mass taken from the later portion. Here the only important direction is that the pontiff shall pray over the Oblation that the Holy Spirit may come down upon it. In the mind of the compiler of these canons the Thanksgiving was no vital part. It is not from any thing that he tells us that we believe that as a matter of fact it was still present among "the prayers which it is meet that he say".

The Thanksgiving, the primitive Eucharist, had now indeed ceased to hold in men's estimation its place as the vital core of the Oblation appointed by Christ. But that it was indeed the primitive Eucharist is surely manifest from the evidence adduced above.

Baptism is the Sacrament of the gift of life. The Holy Eucharist is that of our gratitude used by God as an opportunity of pouring it out upon us with fresh abundance. But, alas for ourselves! Is there any other Liturgy in the world in which the obliteration of the primitive Eucharist is so nearly complete as it is in the English Communion Service?

Immortality and the Person of Jesus Christ

By T. R. Glover,
St. John's College, Cambridge.

I

Strange, is it not? that of the myriads who
Before us pass'd the door of Darkness through,
Not one returns to tell us of the Road,
Which to discover we must travel too.

So Edward Fitzgerald rendered into familiar English the verse of the Persian poet, raising what has been, since first men reflected upon death, the great mystery of it. Why do we know so little about it? It is very hard to believe in a life after death; and yet men have believed in it and do believe in it—drawn to the belief by an instinct, almost an impulse, which makes their reason uneasy but which it cannot stifle and does not in the long run want to stifle. Yet the reason cries for evidence, and again and again it fears that there is none. Again and again the reason has insisted that there is none, it has demonstrated that there can be none; but then, as Lucretius says, the sight of the starry sky wakes thoughts that we fancied were dead, and the work of logic has to be done over again or left in ruins.

Of what sort would the evidence be? Achilles, in a famous passage of the *Iliad*, sees Patroclus in a dream and hears him speak his wishes, and concludes that there is—not life in Hades,—but "a spirit and phantom of the dead"[1]—something. There have been those who

[1] *Iliad*, XXIII, 103.

have held—though it is rather quick thinking—that all belief in life beyond the grave rests on the dreams which primitive man had of the dead. More modern days have seen proof of a spirit-world in hair-brushes arranged in a cruciform pattern on a bed[2]—an extraordinary example of poverty of mind. But for most thoughtful people the so-called evidence of "spiritualists" is suspect; in most cases further investigation has brought proof or presumption of fraud, and fraud of the grossest and most vulgar kind. In any case, what right have we to expect evidence as to the life of the disembodied spirit to be given us in the sphere of matter? This is not to say it would not or could not be, for such sweeping anticipations do not help knowledge forward; but we may at least ask, Why should we look for it so?

The ancient world,—and in many places modern men are at the same point of view—believed in the evidence of visions; and a good deal of ancient religion and of animistic and primitive religion today is occupied with the production and reporting of such visions. One Baptist mission on the Congo lost its most promising and attractive convert as the result of his attending some native ceremony or initiation, during the course of which he saw his dead father and learnt from the dead man's lips that the Christian religion is false. There was no arguing with him—he had seen and spoken with the dead; nor perhaps is there any arguing with others who have seen and spoken with the dead at Lourdes and elsewhere. But for men no longer at the savage point of view, such appearances have ceased to be evidence any more than a statement in a quite unknown tongue. When the Hittite language is deciphered, Hittite evidence as to Egyptian history will be valuable. When we are certain how far visions are, and how far they are not, the product of the brain that records them, the evidence of visions will begin to have value. But at present we

[2] See Podmore, *Modern Spiritualism*, II, 277.

are only beginning to realize what tricks the mind plays upon itself, and the part of the physical nature in suggesting them and joining in the play.

How *does* spirit communicate with spirit? By touch and voice we make our common communications, and more subtly by tone and glance,—and otherwise in ways that we do not altogether understand—that we do not at all understand. There is speculation to-day on Mendelian lines as to the inheritance of spiritual quality along the same channels as physical characteristics; there are spiritual likenesses in families, but spiritual affinities go their own way and spring up strangely. Why should man and man, or man and woman, have such mutual responsiveness of spirit, in thought and feeling,—outside the family and the social group? Why should spoken word or unconscious look or movement tell as it does? Even if the ground is prepared, why should such intangible work of the spirit be so fruitful? I do not want to play with fancies, but I wish to suggest that we do not yet understand in all its mystery how spirit touches spirit. If one may hazard a guess, well realizing that guess-work is guessing and nothing more,—is it possible that there are spirit touches between what we call the two worlds? It is not impossible, but we cannot say there is evidence. Thought-transference so far, even between the living, is rather in the stage of theory than of demonstration.

Wordsworth and others have intuitions as to "impulses"—as to "voices" (*not* auditions in the technical sense at all)—

> Yes, we have
> Answers and we know not whence;
> Echoes from beyond the grave,
> Recogniz'd intelligence?
>
> Such within ourselves we hear
> Ofttimes, ours though sent from far;
> Listen, ponder, hold them dear;
> For of God, of God they are.

Yes, the poets and others speak so, but what do they mean? When they say these things are "ours though sent from far", are they really *theirs* more than the poets supposed, and not sent from very far? The fact that such minds have such experiences, or move in such a way, is to be noted; we shall have to return to it, for its significance may grow; but for the present it is doubtful evidence, though much higher in kind than any to which we have so far referred.

II

Can we find evidence in another sphere, or if not find it, at least get some conviction of its presence very near us—a sane and reliable conviction not so subjective (to use a helpful word in a popular way), not so dependent on the opinion of a single mind, as some that we have considered? Stoic thinkers used to employ the general concensus of mankind as a guide to truth, as a proof. But they used it themselves to prove the legitimacy of divination, to defend the possibility of discovering truth from the flight of birds or the entrails of animals,—for everybody agreed as to the existence of gods, and as to their habits of communication with men, and everybody agreed as to omens and the fields in which they were given or at least found, though their interpretation might lead to disagreement. Other people found a concensus of mankind on the fact that Nature intended some races or individuals to be slaves—slavery was a fact of Nature, in Nature itself, everybody agreed, till the Stoics challenged the concensus with a direct negation. The concensus of mankind will not take us all the way, but it may help us to find our way. Man, as Carlyle said, is the natural enemy of all lies. Man, moreover, we find if we take a wide survey of history, is immensely practical, and in spite of his conservatism, his reluctance to leave the raft that floated his father on these uneasy

seas, sooner or later he will leave the old raft[3] for another of safer design, more navigable, more adjusted to the better known ways of wind and tide. In every affair of life we tacitly assume that the universe is rational and cohesive, calculable where we understand it and intelligible when we are trained enough to grasp its laws; and the more we trust ourselves to this assumed reasonableness of the universe, the more grounds our experience actually gives us for believing it. If we are warranted in this we may go a step further. If human society in its larger aspects begins to base itself on a belief; and if, as it grows more human and deepens its acquaintance with all life taken as a whole, it rests more and more upon that belief; the conclusion will be that that belief, if not wholly coincident with the real truth, comes somewhere very near it—that there is truth in it, in the essence of it. Can we say that the belief in immortality is such a belief?

Before we try to answer that question, let us remind ourselves of another problem. Logic has a great deal to say about freewill. Philosophers have discussed it and seen no way out of their difficulties but to deny it. The same disaster has befallen theologians—Mohammedan and Christian, who have felt themselves forced to think of God as the only real Agent—a conception which paralyzes Islam for Moslem thinkers who really accept it; Christian thinkers have leant to it, emphasized it, loved it (and we can see why), but have generally left some loophole for a human choice, and the smallest puncture in such a doctrine saves us. Nowadays scientific men are playing with Determinism on biological grounds. But if we turn to real life—the life of building and contriving, legislating, ruling and loving, nobody has ever disbelieved in freewill. Every man who has ever touched any real problem, from the chipping of a flint and showing his boy how to do it, up to the handling of an army of a million men over a line of two hundred

[3] Plato, *Phaedo*, 85 CD.

miles,—every woman who has ever had a living baby,—has believed in freewill.[4] Human society collapses when men and women cease to believe in it; or rather, it would collapse, if they ceased, for they never have in the last resort. The negation of freewill has been a fancy or a deduction. Here, then, is a case where we can say clearly that the continuance of society—to say nothing of its progress—is evidence of an overwhelming kind—always assuming the universe to be rational. Can we use the evidence of mankind as a corporate society to help us in the matter of Immortality?

The matter would not be decided by the discovery of a savage tribe which assured an explorer, through an interpreter, that it had no conception of another life, even if the explorer understood his savage friends and they him, and even if they did tell him the truth, and it was true that they had no such conception or belief. I do not think the tribe has been found, though the assertion has often been made. If it were found, many questions would have to be asked as to its history, origin and antecedents—especially whether it were ascending or declining on the human scale, living more deeply or more superficially, as centuries went by. American democracy is not proved imbecile because an English squire or Russian Tsar or Bantu chief never thought about it. We have to judge man by what he is when he is most human—not by the baby and the undeveloped, nor by the senile or paranoiac, nor yet (and this may be more significant) by the hyper-cultured "all on one side, like an ill-roasted egg",

> Deep-versed in books and shallow in himself.

In what I have now to say I wish to avoid a dogmatism for which I do not feel equal. I would wish rather to

[4] Dr. Johnson said: "All theory is against the freedom of the will; all experience for it" (Birkbeck Hill's edition of Boswell's *Life*, Vol. III, 291); and some years before, "Sir, (said he) we *know* our will is free, and *there's* an end on't" (Vol. II, 82).

put the considerations that weigh with me as questions or suggestions, for it is in that form that they really reach me.

First, then, I would ask whether, as society grows more complex and intelligent, and enters more and more into the questions and the laws implied by its own continuance, anything can be made of that Moral Law, on which, whatever we may argue or fancy or choose to think, society does fundamentally rest, unless that Moral Law is something eternal, unless the difference between Right and Wrong is essential and not accidental, unless Right is to be vindicated to the very end, however far off that end may be? At certain stages of civilization, when frontiers have been sacred and before extradition was thought of, persons of vigour would use the frontier as a ready means of escape from justice. Here, it is seen, I merely suggest what Plato and plenty of people less original than Plato have suggested. But I put it as a question, and I realize that the question is open to some criticism as I put it: Is it conceivable that God's law can be dodged by a clumsy device that, by the working of the merest accident, can make the distinction between Right and Wrong the most immeasurably silly thing in the universe—a universe which is nowhere else open to the faintest suggestion of silliness? Is it conceivable that death could bring Jesus and Judas to one level, that God in the long run groups them and is equally done with both of them? "Conceivable" is the word that exposes my question to attack. I see that—many things are conceivable or inconceivable according to the mind that tries to conceive them—but I do not propose at my time of life to surrender to Protagoras or to any other common sense person who tells me that opinions differ and that there is no telling—that nothing in fact can be known, that the laws that make the universe and human society really tell us nothing—in fact are beyond discovery. I cannot believe that.

In the story of human society, the individual grows at once in consciousness of the world and of himself, but unevenly; and there seems to be no answer to Individualism even of the grossest kind unless this eternal cleavage of Right and Wrong stands. And here, as Plato shows in the *Gorgias*, human instinct simply revolts at the doctrines of Callicles and Nietzsche, and says virtually: "Prove what you like; I don't believe you; you've forgotten something—God, I think." But before we begin to speak of God, let us leave society for a little and go indoors; for the family, Aristotle held against Plato, comes before society and is its foundation.

All over the world there are different conceptions of the family, archaic, modern, eastern, western; but the basis of all is the father, the mother, and the child. "You may not have a wedding ring, but you can't help loving the baby", as an ill-trained and vicious girl said of her little bastard to some one trying to befriend her; and Saint Augustine had said the same of his Adeodatus —the baby no one had wanted but which his father somehow felt God gave.[5] Yet savages today, like the civilized Athenians and Romans of old, freely kill their babies. Yes, they do and they did—undeveloped or misdeveloped races and people; but the child, the wife, the husband, the parent assert themselves as the human spirit grows and deepens. On such love society again rests, a deeper foundation even than law, for law also rests on it. What is this love that the simplest and the deepest alike feel when they are true to the eternal instinct within them, and not warped by selfishness or over-refinement, or deadened by generations of starvation or savagery? The ancient philosopher pointed the weeping mother to the cow whose calf was taken—as a model of moderate grief,—an extraordinary illustration of how utterly absurd a man, and a good one, can make himself

[5] See Augustine's *Confessions*, IV: 2, 2: *ubi proles etiam contra votum nascitur; quamvis iam nata cogat se diligi.*

by abstract reasoning.[6] The woman knew well enough she was not a cow. "You had no son before; you have none now; you are not worse off." Well, no;—but she *is* worse off, for she has realized how large human nature can be; she has grown in insight, in depth, in capacity for God-given chances of joy and service. Napoleon was happy enough on Corsica, why not on St. Helena?

> Meantime how much I loved him
> I find out now I've lost him.

The hands are stretched out in longing for the other shore[7]—for him who waits there inaccessible. And in the long run everything that matters to mankind depends on the intensity with which those hands are outstretched. Virgil is right; there is no satisfaction in the grave or out of it, if we are cut off from those who are our life.

Yes, this is getting out of the realm of argument into that of feeling. For, after all, there is no use in arguing without facts. To "work the thing out in theory unclouded by a single fact" is not very fruitful. What are our facts? Here are two, and two elemental facts. Immortality a man can do without for himself as an individual, but not as a parent. Life only grows richer, its meaning is only drawn out, as this faculty for reaching to the further shore becomes more imperative. The heart reaches out in that direction, leaps out—and finds what it needs, in a great faith. "The heart has its reasons which the reason does not know", Pascal said. By and by reason sees one of them—it is on the diffusion of such natures, natures too deep, too tender, too strong to be content with one life, that everything depends for mankind in a reasonable universe, a universe which God took pains to make complete, to leave no gaps in, no negations.

[6]Seneca, *de Consolatione*, 7.
[7]*Aeneid*, VI, 314, *Tendebantque manus ripae ulterioris amore.*

Once again, the savage or the depraved, or the cultured nature all on one side, or the cold heart, is not the ultimate authority, not the ultimate standard. Difficult as it is to believe in life beyond the grave, is it less difficult to disbelieve in it? "Neither with the cursed things, nor without them", is a man's proverb on women, quoted by Aristophanes. We may not be able to manage with this doctrine of Immortality, but we cannot manage without it. With the fullest realization of its difficulties—not merely those of the head but those of the heart too,—men and women, grown and deepened into natures where humanity is most thoroughly and essentially human, have held the faith that God does not play with us as children with sand castles, building elaborately and content to see the waves wash all away, playing not with senseless sand, but with sentient natures like His own. That would be inconceivable—inconceivable again, to whom? To the best and deepest, those trained and intelligent natures, taught in the school of love and pain.

So far nothing has been said of religion, unless indirectly. How deeply intertwined, consciously and unconsciously, with social life and family life is religion, it is hard even to imagine. A man's religion, his relation with the unseen powers surrounding and supporting his life, his conception of that power or powers and his management of act and conduct in conformity with that conception—such things must in some degree or other, affect every link that binds him to wife, child, tribe or city.[8] As we study the history of religions,—and this is, after all, the region where men have been most serious —two things stand out;—polytheism, stubborn, and tenacious of life as it may be, can never in the long run hold the field against monotheism; and with the rise of monotheism we mark a corresponding rise in the sense of the value of the individual, and with this is apt to

[8] See Carlyle, *Heroes*, lect. i.

come the belief in immortality. Primitive man believes in many gods, many spirits and daemons; and the soul may be one of them; he worships the dead in order to induce them to leave him alone; he hardly believes that there is any among these dim beings that really cares for him on his own account. But as such beings fall into the background, and the man comes more and more clearly face to face with One God, everything tends to change. It could hardly be otherwise. The part which monotheism, touched by this sense of a real relation of some sort between the One God and the individual man, has played in human history is very great; and, once more, to men who live in a rational universe is it quite conceivable that the whole thing is a cheat? that the human mind with its curious gift for divining the real nexus between things, its passion for truth, its powers of discovery and of using everything it discovers, is utterly and miserably deceived when it comes to the very centre of everything? Once more, we must not let a word like "conceivable" bully us or coax us away from the examination of evidence, but once again we have surely to weigh alternatives and to understand how the deepest-going minds in any sphere of thought—especially in that which now concerns us—have been led, or have come, to their conclusions.

III

It is instructive to take the movement of thought over centuries among the peoples of antiquity who have shaped the thinking of mankind. The Greek and the Hebrew peoples had conceptions of the other world much alike at one stage, but their development took different ways, and the decisive factor seems to have been monotheism. Among the Greeks it appeared indeed, but rather as monism, and it never won a decisive victory over polytheism. Among the Hebrews polytheism slowly died,

and thought moved gradually, under one stimulus and another, to a high view of the deathless individuality of the soul, never reached among the Greeks.

Homer's picture of the other world is famous—a nerveless, noiseless existence, existence, as it were, without life, in a darkness that allowed only a bare consciousness of discomfort, without distinctions, between good or bad, brave or coward. Sons-in-law of gods reached Happy Isles, at some stage of the poems, but the picture of the world beyond as drawn by Odysseus is cheerless and hopeless.

With the development of the Greek cities in Asia Minor in the eighth century B. C. and the simultaneous awakening of the Greek mind all over the world and in every realm of thought, we find the great intellectual movement associated with the philosophers and inquirers of Ionia accompanied by another movement altogether on European soil. The cults of Orpheus and Dionysius, the mysteries of Eleusis, with their teaching of another life and of the need of preparation for it, may not have appealed—did not, so far as we know, appeal—to the circles of Thales and Heraclitus, but they captured a great constituency precisely in the period when men began to frame deeper thoughts, and to see things with clearer edges. It was a world of growing individualism—the Greek always leaned, more than the Roman, for instance, to a consciousness of his own claims on society and on Nature, even though at this period he still had a vivid local patriotism. He was beginning to be more definitely than ever an individual. In such generalizations there is apt to be error, but the initiatory cult as we find it in Greece means the individual conscious of himself and provident of his own future after death.

"Happy is he that has seen the doing of sacred things, the awful rites (of Eleusis); he that is not initiate and he that has part therein, have never the same lot, when dead and in dank darkness below." [9]

[9] *Homeric Hymn to Demeter*, 474–482.

Such language is unmistakable; a man is advised to be initiated, he chooses or does not choose to accept the privilege, and he makes his own future by his choice.

On the whole the philosophic mind rejected the cults along with the myths of the gods and much else, and the movement of the fifth century, with its thorough-going rationalism and its reference of everything to the standard of each individual, was not one to re-establish anything. Two names stand out at this point—names of representative and formative men—Euripides and Plato. Euripides combined in a very impressive way two strains not easily reconciled—he had a mind relentlessly logical, loyal to the new standards of thought, exigent to the bitter end for demonstration (his own word), and with it a faculty for passionate feeling. His insight into the human heart brings him to the verge of belief in immortality; he hovers about the problem—

> Who knows if life itself indeed be death?—

but he will not recognize the craving of the heart for the object of its love as evidence. His reason checks his feeling, and he leaves the question in suspense—we have "no experience of death", he says, and hearsay evidence is guesswork—"borne upon tales we drift, drift idly." God also for him is not demonstrated.

Plato, however, does not reject this intuition that there must be something beyond, though he sees as clearly that intuition is not demonstration. What he has to say on the subject he casts in the form of myth—

> "I do not mean to affirm that the description which I have given of the soul and her mansions is exactly true—a man of sense ought hardly to say that. But I do say that, inasmuch as the soul is shown to be immortal, he may venture to think that something of the kind is true. The venture is a glorious one." [10]

But Plato strongly puts forward another doctrine about the soul, which, it is said, has an eastern origin—the transmigration of souls, and he binds it up with im-

[10] Plato, *Phaedo*, 114.

mortality. Euripides had known of this doctrine,—it was in the air, for it seems that the Orphics taught it—but he would not have to do with it, it was a fancy without evidence of any kind and he let it alone. Plato took it up and gave it new currency.

How far thought and the conditions of national and social life react and are each other's product, it is always hard to say, but individualism is the mark of the age of Plato and his successors. The philosophers who shaped the thinking of later Greece were nearly all unmarried and childless, many of them foreigners, voluntary exiles from their native places, some even barbarians, it would seem—men, in short, who lacked all or nearly all the spiritual ties that make us thoroughly human. Their thought is individualistic—Stoic or Epicurean, Cynic or Sceptic, it is all one; the city-state, shaken and virtually obsolete amid the great empires, was no longer a religion (so to speak) but a club, hardly an object of loyalty at all. If the transmigration of souls was at all widely believed in Greece—it is hard to say whether it was—it also worked against the social sense. The old primitive ancestor-worship, impossible now, had at least held the family together, as the city cult had held the city. But the transmigration of souls meant that all family ties were accidental and transitory—each man for himself, as he made his next reincarnation, or chose it in some Platonic other world. Whether the Epicurean offered a better or a worse prospect in utter resolution into elemental atoms, who shall say? Resolution into atoms even on the showing of the religious might be better than the ceaseless "sorrowful weary wheel" [11] and eternal redying, as some one called it. The Epicurean had no gods who were more inert than himself. With the Stoic, life in this world was on a higher plane, but he was sure neither of gods nor the soul. God might be Fate or the Universe or Nature—it did not matter, such

[11] A phrase on one of the gold tablets of Petelia.

knowledge was needless.[12] And as for the soul, why fear change into something else which the cosmos needs? passing into "the dear and the kin, the elements"? Immortality had no secure foundation in Greek thought, and men and women turned to Oriental cults which offered some sure foothold on something—god or goddess, it might be, with whom some kind of sure relation could be established; but there were weak points in the facts that the god or goddess was only one amongst others, and in the want of connection of the cult with either morals or truth.

When we turn to the Hebrews it is quite another story. The Old Testament, as it is commonly read, is a confusion, but historical criticism finds a pathway. It then appears that there are there two groups of conflicting ideas, one derived ultimately from ancestor worship, the other and later from monotheistic belief.[13] The emphasis of the great prophets was upon the fact of God; on the earthward side they rather looked to the nation and its destiny than dealt with the individual and his hopes and fears as to another life. They did a great work, for they drove Israel out of the notion of a local and tribal God into the awful thought of One God who rules all the ends of the earth, who taketh up the isles as a very little thing. There are gleams of recognition of what such a God means for the individual. The poet, who wrote *Job*, "reflects all the darkness of the popular doctrine and likewise exhibits the actual steps whereby the human spirit rose gradually to the apprehension that man's soul is capable of a divine life beyond the grave"; even in death, he feels, it is "still capable of the highest spiritual activities, though without the body", but he seems not to hint that this higher life may be endless, natural inference as it seems to us from the train of his thought.[14] The 73rd and 139th Psalms and the

[12] Justin Martyr, *Trypho*, c. 2. [13] R. H. Charles, *Eschatology*, p. 52.
[14] R. H. Charles, *Eschatology*, pp. 71, 72.

inserted 26th chapter of Isaiah show a later and higher development. But generally in the Old Testament Sheol is the eternal abode of the dead, with various modifications, as man's thoughts of God and of the hereafter grew deeper and clearer.

It was at one time a fashion to attribute much of later Jewish thought on our subject to Persian influence, but scholars today seem much less ready to assert this.[15] It is rather during the Macedonian period that the great step forward was taken from One God to His concern with each man forever. Many notions were afloat as to the Messiah and His Kingdom, the destinies of nations and of men, and these were held unevenly as thoughts are—here discarded by the careless, there outgrown by the profounder spirits, in another region cherished by the pious as an inheritance side by side with other thoughts and hopes incompatible with them. The Apocalyptic books, more familiar today than ever before, give, in a somewhat confused way, a clue to the growth of Jewish thought down to the times of Jesus and His disciples. They show how a people deeply harassed by problems of national history and national future, persecuted by foreign rulers and abused by native princes, growingly conscious of the individual and all the ties of love and the implications of Right and Wrong, came to cast more and more on God—above all, to link the individual to Him till some last judgment in some world, in this world or a better uncontaminated by matter, sever bad from good, Gentile from Jew, and end in the casting away of Gentiles and all evil men, and the gathering of the good in the Kingdom of God. Hades has been moralized. The body might be raised, or perhaps not,—they could not be sure; it depended on how they thought

[15] J. H. Moulton, *Early Zoroastrianism*, p. 321, quoting Bousset, and agreeing that Zarathushtra practically is to be struck out of the list of the prophets who contributed to the growth of Israel's religion.

of matter; but God and the soul and immortality are disentangling themselves from accidental associations and standing more and more in the light as the real things of experience and of faith. The Jew has come nearer to the heart of the problem than the Greek.

IV

Into such a world Jesus was born and there He founded His society, gathering disciples from circles where the Apocalyptic books were read and known, where men thought in the terms of Apocalyptic. He too, it would seem, used the language, as Plato used the Orphic terminology, and yet was as little an adherent of any Apocalyptic school as Plato was of the Orphics. His disciples, it would appear, believed in God, in the soul, in immortality, in future judgment, before He called them—believed, as we say, in a sort of a way. Afterwards they believed with a new conviction, a new energy, though some of them were long in working out of the old ideas, and perhaps unconsciously, when they quoted His teaching, imported more of these old ideas into that teaching than belonged there. It is quite clear that Jesus identified Himself with the growing belief in God, the soul and immortality, and He gave an immense impetus to it.

For the early Christian one argument sufficed for immortality—Christ is risen. Men had seen Him, had heard Him, had spoken with Him, had touched Him. Stoics and Epicureans in Athens laughed when Paul came to the rising again of the dead men—educated people did not talk so; they laughed and dismissed the subject, and went away to thresh again the rotten straw of Zeno and Epicurus, for Athens was a University city.[16] Can we today say with Paul: "But now is Christ risen

[16] If I borrow a phrase from the *Life of Stirling*, I have not forgotten Seneca and Epictetus, good men and true—though both took their turns at this same straw.

from the dead, and become the first fruits of them that slept", or have we to trim our speech to come a little nearer Athens, a little nearer the Stoics and the Mendelists? There is no help for it for us; we have to consider the Resurrection of Christ side by side with what we are coming to know of the facts of psychology to which I referred at an earlier point. We have to consider the tricks the mind plays upon itself and the part of the physical nature in suggesting them and joining in the play; and we have to ask whether the disciples were not just at that stage of culture when the mind fails to realize it is playing such tricks, and whether we must say that Christ did *not* rise from the dead, but that certain psychopathic temperaments thought He did and suggested it to others. We shall ask such questions, and in the present state of knowledge we shall not get, if we are in a hurry, any very encouraging answer.

Guesses have been made at what happened—guesses conditioned by our very slight knowledge of the soul and its way; and I shall not add to their number. Instead I will offer two inconclusive suggestions. First: the group of men we meet in the *Epistles* and the *Acts* are the same we met in the *Gospels*, but they are greatly changed. That is history and it must be recognized, and then if possible understood. The train passed through a tunnel (if the figure serves to describe a gap in our knowledge of the church's history); we saw it before it entered and after it left, and the same people were in it before and after; but something happened in the tunnel; we may recognize so much and quite honestly say that we do not exactly know what it was that happened; but we must, if we are to remain honest, admit that it was something very exceptional and very signal, for it has changed the history of the world. Second: when we have two fragments of a sculpture, or a history or a song, which do not fit together, and when a third piece is found which fits both and makes now not three

fragments but one whole, we are generally right in saying that it is authentic. I cannot forget the start with which I realized that if we fit the resurrection of the body of Jesus in between the story we find in the *Gospels* and that which we find in the *Acts*, the historical sequence is perfect and we have one story. This is not to say that no difficulties are left—no, very far from saying that—and difficulties of more kinds than one.

But in any case, Paul put the matter once and for all when he said: "If in this life only we have hope in Christ, we are of all men most miserable." We may not yet be able to solve our difficulties as historians, to be sure as to the details or the central fact of the story of the risen Christ, to be clear as to the value of the discourses of Christ reported in the Fourth Gospel, but one thing is forever luminously clear—the Christian faith is bound up with immortality; both stand or fall together. Here again, if we may use the sort of canon I tried to apply before, we can say that, if Christian history and experience go for anything at all in a rational universe, then they point to some essential truth in the belief in Immortality. For my own part, it is only the Christian history and experience, to be read in the life of the Christian generations and still verifiable in life today, that guarantees for me any part of Jesus Christ's significance. All that has past, all that has been done, seems to me to carry us back to Him, to heighten His value, to force us to ever more vigorous effort to apprehend Him. If I may say it without seeming to fall back on the technical language of others, Immortality for me depends on the Person of Jesus Christ; and I am glad to know that there are others whose position is the same. Here I avail myself of quotation.

"I remember one night some years ago talking with my cousin, then a Professor in Edinburgh University. He had just lost a near relative, and come home from the funeral. We were talking about the life to come. I said that our immortality to me seemed to follow naturally from the Christian idea of God. Almighty Love could

never allow a soul that loved it to drop out of being. He said, I remember, 'Well, I don't know. I don't find it is easy to look at these things in the abstract. To me Death is very like the blowing out of a candle'—then with emphasis he said, 'but I do not believe that it is so, for He said otherwise and He knew'. Of course 'He' meant Christ."

Jesus, it may be said, added little to the ideas of the Apocalyptic writers, but it would not be very wisely said. What genius does, we are told, is not so much to strike out new thought as to add new value to old, and it does this by bringing out its own inherent significance. The disciples and the writers of Apocalyptic books believed in God in a sort of way. If we say, "so did Jesus", we are wrong, for it is always bad criticism to suppose that to the original mind words mean at all what they do to the quotational type, the intelligent echoes. So far we have seen God and immortality associated, and if now we find them again associated in the mind of Jesus, to understand the one we have to grasp the other. If we are to judge of His right to an opinion on this matter of immortality, we have to make sure that we have exhausted the value and connotation of "God" in His thought and speech, that we are at His point of view and see God as He sees God, feel Him, understand Him, share His life and work, as Jesus does. Such a canon of procedure would be laid down whatever the historical or literary personality we might be studying. The word comes from the thought,—have we fathomed the thought of Jesus? The thought comes out of the experience,—how near are we to realizing that? The experience depends on, as it helps to make, the personality? Are we sure there? I feel we have not under our hands the whole evidence in the case for Immortality until we have made better use of the experience, the insight and intuition, the personality of Jesus of Nazareth. If, as already suggested, it is the developed and not the immature, the whole man and not the half man, whose thought and insight count, whatever the sphere con-

cerned, then surely here above all we must ask what does our utmost Man think? and why does He think it, and how does He reach it?

It is to be noted, too, that Jesus chiefly speaks of God in relation to individuals, as if it were in and through such relations that God is best to be known. The magnificent pictures of the Old Testament—"Clouds and darkness are round about Him",—"The sea is His and He made it and His hands formed the dry land"—such pictures and conceptions Jesus hardly uses. All His talk, so far as we have it, turns on the significance of the individual to God, and in this He gives the individual a new value, associating him with a God so rich Himself in new values. In parable after parable Jesus brings out the incredible interest of God in the individual and His love of him. Perhaps the crowning instance is the conclusion to the parable of the lost sheep, where He borrows or re-creates a scene from *Job*. When God in *Job* shows the new-made universe to His friends,

> The morning stars sang together,
> And all the sons of God shouted for joy.

In Jesus' story this happened for one sinner who repented. Is it credible that the moral being of a solitary human unit is so full of import for God? Could it be, if that human unit were as evanescent as the drift of smoke from a steamer at sea? Is not the bottom knocked out of all Jesus' teaching, is He not very nearly discredited, if Pindar is right after all with his thought:

> "What is any of us? What not? Children of a day! A dream of a shadow is man."

For here is a case, it looks, of "either . . . or . . ."—one way or the other—the love of God for the single lonely human soul, or the whole race a dream of a shadow. A middle path seems hardly possible here.

Is there anything of moment for our purpose in the fact that where Jesus Christ has been real for men, they have instinctively believed in immortality, that it fol-

lowed naturally? In the fact that where love and loss together wake the instinct and the intuition for immortality, men, wherever He is fairly presented to them, naturally gravitate to Jesus? *Anima naturaliter Christiana*, in Tertullian's phrase. Is it a vicious circle, or is it the natural fitness of things?

So far we have spoken of Jesus as a teacher with a unique experience of God, but if we submit our minds in all fairness to the experience of His personality—live with Him, in Him, by Him, as Christians have—the matter does not rest there. He begins to transcend our categories and classifications, until we have to grapple in earnest with the Christian conception of Incarnation, and the Christian belief that He not merely gives us the truth about God, but brings God into our life here and now, and that He is in some way the author of a higher life, the Saviour of souls, the captain of our salvation, in Whom God will sum up all things as the goal of all creation. The language of Paul and the Fourth Gospel and other early Christian documents is not that which we use today—its terms suggest themes outside our study, larger modes of handling reality, for which we are not ready. Our treatment of Immortality will be conditioned by our Christology. If in the past the conception of God has been the decisive thing in the belief of Immortality, today it is our conception of Christ that will be the norm of all our thinking, for on that depends all we think of God. Who then was Jesus, and what *is* He? And what His relation to God? If we have gone so far in Christian experience as to give Him the high place that somehow He reaches when men are honest with Him and with themselves and the handling of life, the discussion of Immortality will be reopened, but on a higher and a happier plane.

Fundamental Characteristics of New Testament Christology

By Reinhold Seeberg, D. Theol., D. Phil. et Jur.,
Professor in the University of Berlin.[1]

A year ago I published a booklet under the title, *The Origin of Our Faith in Christ.*[2] The discussion of the treatise which had just begun was cut off by the great war. I feel prompted to present the main results of my investigations to American theologians also. On account of the space at my disposal it is impossible for me to furnish more detailed proofs of my statements. For such I must refer the reader to my brochure as well as to other of my publications.[3] In the meantime, however, my views have become clearer and more well-defined.

The fundamental problem of the New Testament evolves around the question how the belief in Jesus the Christ ever arose. What took place that the people in all its spiritual and bodily needs soon began to call upon the same man who at his death had commended his soul to God (Acts 7:59, II Cor. 12:8), so that they could be named people who called upon the name of our Lord Jesus (I Cor. 1:2)? I have the impression that the question hitherto has not been satisfactorily answered, but

[1] Translated by Jacob Quiring, A. M., University of Berlin.

[2] *Der Ursprung des Christusglaubens.*

[3] I here call attention to some of my works in which I fully discussed and substantiated a number of questions which in this study can only be touched upon. In this connection I mention the following: *The Origin of Our Faith in Christ* (Leipzig, 1914), *Manual of the History of Doctrines*, a second thoroughly revised edition, Vol. I (Leipzig, 1908); and the smaller studies in my collection of essays, *From Religion and History*, Vol. I (Leipzig, 1906).

that this can be done. And, at the same time, I believe that the answer, if given in accord with the simple thoughts of the New Testament, will offer a plausible solution of the great Christological problem, well suited to intervene in the great contrasts of the different theological groups in a conciliatory, clarifying way.

I

A critic who does not allow himself to be biased by dogmatic considerations will hardly fail to recognize that, if examined as to the question where the superhuman and divine with Christ find their clear expression, the synoptic Gospels above all point to the baptism of Jesus. Here we learn that the divine spirit came upon the man Jesus. Thereby the son of Mary became the son of God, the anointed one with the Spirit. Henceforth he speaks and acts by impulse of the Spirit and in his power. Through this Spirit he begins to realize his peculiar task and authority (Lk. 10:21). The Spirit determines his movements and actions (Lk. 4:14, Mt. 4:1). It is "his spirit" (Mk. 2:8) and he gains the conviction that through the possession of the Spirit the prophecy finds its fulfilment in him (Lk. 4:18, Mt. 11:4f). On the one hand this spirit is operative in Jesus as wisdom (Mk. 6:2, Mt. 11:19), on the other as power and authority, especially over the opposing, evil spirits (Mk. 1:27, 6:14). Thus from the very beginning Jesus became aware of the power of his spirit when he was "led up into the wilderness to be tempted by the devil" (Mt. 4:1ff.).

There is spirit in Jesus. God's thoughts and powers move him. Thereby, however, he establishes the promised kingdom, *i. e.*, government of God with its saving grace among men. The one in whom the spirit of God dwells is the divine ruler who transmits salvation to mankind. That there was spirit in Jesus even his adversaries did not deny, neither did they question that it was a powerful spirit. But they declared it to be a devilish spirit (Mt. 12:24).

Jesus, on the other hand, had the full clear consciousness of divine power and heavenly commission. "If I by the Spirit of God cast out demons, then is the Kingdom come upon you" (Mt. 12:28). Jesus observes that this kingdom carried itself through in the world under storm and violence (Mt. 11:12, Lk. 16:16); he came, as he himself says, "to cast fire upon the earth" (Lk. 12:49). Under all these and similar terms we are to understand nothing else than Jesus' works among men in the saving power of the spirit. The kingdom in its liberating character and the spirit are essentially identical in this connection. If with Luke we find the reading, "Thy spirit come," instead of, "Thy kingdom come," as Matthew has it, we must say that such a text conveys a perfectly relevant explanation.

II

But what about the "spirit" which Jesus possesses? It might have been difficult for Gentile Christians to understand the second petition of the Lord's Prayer, since they were not familiar with the term "kingdom of God". Luke therefore substituted "spirit", whereas Matthew, in an explanatory way, adds, "Thy will be done". This interpretation fully agrees with the Lucan conception. "Spirit" in the Bible means: power, strength, energy. With persons, therefore, spirit is best explained by the expression "will". The spirit is the person himself as active, or the will and energy of this person. Thereby the spirit may be thought of as relatively separate from the divine person, as a special hypostasy like "wisdom" for instance. This hypostatical conception of the spirit, quite familiar to the Jews, is of the greatest importance for the origin of Christology. Only through this notion it became possible to conceive of Christ as a distinct being, and at the same time as God, without coming into collision with monotheism. It was likewise not impossible to comprehend Jesus and the spirit as a

personal unity; for we know that with those possessed of demons the evil spirit may take the place of the human I, or that by virtue of the divine genius in him, the Roman Emperor became God.

These parallels explain how the risen Jesus could be felt and believed upon as a heavenly person. The appearances of the risen Master in the first instance attested to the continuance of the life of the man Jesus, to whom God had borne witness in the resurrection of the dead (Acts. 2:32, 3:15, 4:10–33, 10:40–41). But because effects of a heavenly spirituality emanated from the risen one and because his existence did not prove itself any longer a mere earthly-human one—he was not with his disciples as he had formerly been (Lk. 24:44)—, the divine spirit of Jesus now became his real nature. With him the man Jesus coalesced to such a degree that he now lent a distinct personal form to the spirit which in itself, as we saw, was capable of being viewed hypostatically. Thus originated the belief in the heavenly spirituality of Jesus, or, in other words, in his godhead. But inasmuch as Jesus had promised his disciples the spirit, and the fulfilment of the prophecy in Joel 3 was still in arrears, the possibility resulted of assuming beside Christ, the spirit, the Holy Spirit, whose reality proved itself in definite experiences of the disciples. As they took the spirit in Is. 11 to be a prophecy of the Christ-spirit, so they understood Joel 3 as a prophecy of the Holy Spirit.

But if the spirit of Jesus had been the spirit of the saving kingdom of God for Christ,—who now according to his nature is spirit—a more appropriate designation than that of the *Lord* could not be found. "God has made him both Lord and Christ, this Jesus, whom ye crucified" (Acts 2:36). The latter took place at his baptism when the Spirit came down upon him, the former at his resurrection "in the spirit" (I Pet. 3:18, I Tim. 3:16), whereby, after all, he was "determined" (Rom. 1:4) to be the Spirit and heavenly ruler, so that he is also Lord

and Vanquisher of all angelic powers (Col. 2:10, Phil. 2:10, Eph. 1:20, Rom. 8:37, I Pet. 3:21, Heb. 1:4ff). The full authority which Christ exercises in God's kingdom as a personal spirit, makes him *Kyrios* or Lord. This is the origin of the important designation of Christ, and it is wrong to suppose, as has latterly been done, that the title "Lord" was intended to assign the place of a demigod to Christ, which would make his cult mean nothing more than hero-worship.

III

These observations are confirmed by the highly interesting Christology of Paul. First of all, it becomes perfectly clear from Paul, which sense primitive Christianity attached to the kyrios-title. With Paul *kyrios* always means Christ, while *theos* is reserved for God, the Father. No doubt, Paul here follows a well-established usage of the word. In the above mentioned publication, *The Origin of Belief in Christ*, I have proved, that, according to Rabbinic tradition, *Elohim* (= *theos*) designates God pre-eminently as judge, while Yahwe (=*adonai*=*kyrios*) represents him as the merciful one. Another Rabbinic tradition followed by Philo, takes *kyrios* with reference to God in the sense of ruler and judge, *theos* on the other hand as revealing God's creative power and kindness. It is evidently a tradition similar to the latter which follows Paul. When he uses "God" he thinks of the creator, father and supreme governor, but when he applies the term "Lord" he points to him as the ruler of mankind, the God of history, whose special interest in this age is centered in the building up of a church, the body of Christ. But Paul is by no means of the opinion that "the Lord" is a god of an inferior order or a so-called "cult-hero" (*Kultheros*). On the contrary, he makes it very plain that with him "Lord" refers to the unsurpassable "name that is above every name" (Phil. 2:9ff). This of course is that name which God adopted for himself, *i.e.* the name

Yahwe, for which the Jew regularly substituted *adonai* = *kyrios*.

This is the surprising conclusion that Paul designedly and regularly attributed the name of the Old Testament covenant-God to Christ. To him it was the same God who as *Yahwe* had reigned over the people of Israel and now as Christ was building and governing the Church. Or, more exactly, it was the same aspect of his divine nature, which here as well as there manifested itself as *kyrios*. It is the one and the same God who, in showing us another side of his nature, is also seen as creator and *theos*.

This peculiar differentiation becomes clear if we remind ourselves of the fact that Christ as being present is viewed as heavenly spirit. This is also the prevailing conception with Paul. All those passages which speak of the all-pervading energy of Christ and use the double formula "Christ in us" and "we in Christ", are only intelligible from the viewpoint that Christ is essentially spirit. In addition to this, Paul expressly states: "The Lord is the Spirit" (II Cor. 3:17), or designates him "a life-giving spirit" (II Cor. 15:45), and represents the Christians as merged with him in mystical union into *one* spirit (I Cor. 6-17).

Everyone will here recognize the clear connection of the Christ in Paul's writings with the synoptic tradition. Was the inner nature of Christ with Paul the spirit, and did he in the power of this spirit exercise authority and bring nigh the kingdom of God, then here with the synoptists Christ, according to his true character, is spirit also and as such is the Lord who exercises authority over man and his history (Rom. 14:9, Col. 1:13, I Cor. 15:24). The difference is but this: that the synoptists, because they speak of the historic form of Christ, put in the foreground his concrete human appearance, in which the spirit dwells, while Paul is chiefly concerned with the Spirit himself whom he conceives as heavenly reality.

The spirit of God, therefore, is the revealing and govern-

ing element in God. He manifested himself in *Yahwe* and is also the Spirit who moved the man Jesus and now lives and works together with him in personal unity in heaven, so that Christ is the head of the congregation as well as its author, and also the divine energy which builds up and governs the same.

IV

But Jesus was withal a human being. Paul, too, knows the individual features of his human life and nowhere does he intrepret them anew in docetic fashion. Therewith arises the real Christological question: How is that divine, pneumatic element in Christ related to his historic human appearance? It must be stated, from the very beginning, that Paul never doubted the reality of the human life of Jesus, be it his birth or his preaching, his death or his resurrection. But what is the mutual relationship of the divine and human in Christ?

Paul never reflected upon this as a problem. But there are two different clues in his letters which may shed light on this question. It is of interest to learn to know them, because they represent the two types of Christology which control the historic development of dogmatics. The one, as worked out in Alexandrian theology, rests more upon immediate pious feeling and upon the requirement of a concrete view; the other, as represented by Antiochian Christology, is of a more theoretical and rational character. The first conception is very obvious in II Cor. 8:9 and especially in Phil. 2:5–11. The subject which Paul has in mind here is the man Jesus. But this man once existed in a godlike form, into which he again entered through resurrection after the humiliation and sufferings of his earthly career. Here it really looks as if we had a transformation and thereupon a retransformation of one and the same being. Of course, Paul cannot well be of the opinion that the heavenly spirit was actually transformed into human flesh. We know that he rather dis-

tinguishes the bodily-human element in Jesus from the "fulness of the Godhead" in him (Col. 2:9). The words in Philippians must, therefore, be understood in the following way: Christ to Paul (at present) was one personal being. The different parts, of which this being consists, can, for the sake of clearness, *so* be united with each other, as if they were consecutive stages of a development, since there prevails first the one and then the other.

If viewed thus, this more popular conception of Pauline Christology does not contradict the more precise formulation of the idea as we have it in Rom. 1: 3, 4. Paul here proceeds from the historic appearance of Jesus. "He was born of the seed of David according to the flesh." But in him the "spirit of holiness" was active and that in such a way that he "determined" his nature and therefore conditioned his destiny. Because "spirit" pervaded this man during his earthly life, it was ordered by God that after his death, as soon as he had risen, he should live on in power, *i.e.*, in a state wrought by the spirit. Because the man Jesus was bearer of the heavenly spirit, he shall live on in pneumatic divine form, in the unity of the spirit. In him is consummated in transcendental reality what the believers on earth experience but image-like: the unification of the Christ-spirit (I Cor. 6:17—He that is joined unto the Lord is one spirit). The same is meant when in I Cor. 15:45 we read of Jesus, the second Adam, as having become (namely through the resurrection) a "life-giving spirit". With reference to this transformation of the human in Jesus one must finally think of the fact that indeed all believers shall at one time become pneumatic, and receive a pneumatic body (I Cor. 15:44, 52ff). The addition in I Cor. 15:47f that the "second Adam", *i.e.*, the man Jesus, "is of heaven", shows, it is true, that this "second Adam" is but another designation of the "son of Man" and that Paul regarded the humanity of Jesus ideally as pre-existent, because he therein followed Jewish metaphysical thought which held that everything

great upon earth, the Messiah therefore also, was pre-existent. But all this is of no importance for the understanding of the fundamental lines in Paul's Christology.

Paul's doctrine may be briefly summarized thus: The Spirit who is "the Lord", dwells in all his fulness in Jesus, who, according to the flesh, is of the seed of David. Through his resurrection the man Jesus is spiritualized to such a degree that in some way he merges with the divine energy into one spirit. Thus the Christ, who manifests his presence, is not only Spirit and Lord but also Jesus, the son of David. At the same time Paul, in a more popular language and form, represents the matter as if the same personal unity, which Jesus and the Spirit now constitute in heaven, had once prevailed not only ideally but really in Christ's pre-existence. How he came to use this mode of expression is all the more intelligible since he also thought of an ideal pre-existence of the man Jesus.

V

The New Testament Christology received its final form through John. There are a number of passages in which John reflects the Christology of the synoptists. Jesus received the Spirit at his baptism without measure and thereby was enabled to be "mighty in words and deeds" (Jo. 1:33, 3:34, 5:30, 6:63, 12:49, 13:21, 14:10). "For him the Father hath sealed" (Jo. 6:27), words which, according to New Testament usage, refer to the gift of the Spirit at his baptism (II Cor. 1:22, Eph. 1:13, 4:30).

One can easily see that this conception harmonizes with the fundamental idea of Paul. But the historic importance of the Johannine Christology rests upon something else. John has put the more popular formula of Paul in Phil. 2 into a very concise expression which has become authoritative in Christology. We think of the famous words in the prologue: "The Word became flesh" (1:14). According to the context the logos does not refer

to the man-born, but to the heavenly Christ. However, to me it also seems certain that John does not apply the word in the sense the Logos is used in Greek philosophy, but that he conceives of it as the revealing active word of God, as incontrovertibly follows from Jo. 1:18 and the application of the Logos in the Old Testament tradition. John in all probability refers to the Jewish notion of "*Memra*".

John represents the importance of the Logos in the prologue in three concentric circles. It was active at creation as vital energy which at the same time was spiritual light, yet "darkness apprehended it not" (1:1–5). Similar ideas we find in Rom. 1:20. That John (1:3–10) attributes to the Logos a mediating position in the work of creation, as Paul also does (I Cor. 8:6, Col 1:16), does not necessarily indicate the influence of Greek thought, but above all, points to the place the Spirit takes in the creation-story (Gen. 1:2). This spiritual light, however, also appeared in history; in the first place through the witness of John the Baptist. But "they that were his own received him not", although he had been their creator, and in spite of the wonderful privilege given to them that received him (1:6–13). However, he did not only work in nature and history—"the logos became flesh"—he "tabernacled among us" as a real man in whom God's glory was manifested to all, and who alone, as God only begotten declares the deep things of God (1:14–18).

It is obvious that all John has to say of the Logos might be derived from the language of Paul with reference to "the Spirit". Indeed, the Johannine "Logos" is nothing else than the Pauline "*Pneuma*". This is best corroborated by the fact that John elsewhere plainly speaks of the *Pneuma* in his Christology. The question only remains, why John makes the hard, paradoxical statement, "Logos became flesh"? First of all, it must be clear from the context of the prologue that the Logos

was not only active in the world as a creative or historic principle, but as an empiric sensuous reality. But this in itself would not yet explain the expression. We know, however, from Irenaeus that John combated the view of the Gnostic Kerinth, who declared that the Logos separated himself from Jesus when the latter died. Over against this, John intended strongly to emphasize that the union of the Logos with the flesh was indissoluble, because it is natural and meets us right at the beginning of Jesus' earthly career. Therefore he expresses his thought in the phrase, "The Logos became flesh".

John therewith only formulates in a concise phrase the popular expression in Paul's Christology. He wishes to say that the divine spirit united itself with Jesus from the very moment the Saviour entered this world, and for this reason, can never part from him. But if John puts the union of the divine with the human at the very beginning of Jesus' earthly life— this at least seems to be the meaning of the words, "became flesh"—the common conception must have been that the divine spirit entered into a special relationship with Jesus when the latter took upon himself human form (cp. Mt. 1:18, Lk. 1:35).

Thus Jesus is a real man. In the face of the common error that John had emphasized the deity of Christ to such a degree that the humanity of Jesus in consequence was forgotten, we would rather say that he laid stress upon the fact that just through the real human life and work of the Saviour, the divine found its expression, since "the Logos became flesh". He, the human-born, is the only begotten, to which John in an explanatory way adds: "God only begotten in the bosom of the Father". I assume thereby that in Jo. 1:18 we have to read μονογενὴς θεός and not μονογενὴς υἱός.

These are, as I hold it, the fundamental lines of New Testament Christology. I hope the reader will recognize that there follows from it a real historic understanding of

the origin of our faith in Christ. I resist the temptation of casting a glance into dogmatic theology and to show, how, on the strength of this historic knowledge of the first Christological statements, there also arise very important aspects for the dogmatic doctrines of the Trinity and of Christology. Both doctrines are about to become obsolete in the life of the congregation of our day and generation, however much the avowal to them may be evaluated. It is one of the essential tasks of the theology of the present to reconstruct upon Biblical ground the doctrine of the Trinity and Christology, so that all the religious motives from which they once arose are carefully preserved and yet at the same time made intelligible to the feeling and thought of modern man. Perhaps at some other time there will be an opportunity to say something about this.

Intellectualist Theodicy in France

By Clément Besse,
Chargé de Cours à l'Institut Catholique de Paris.

In the Memorandum which was found upon Pascal after his death, the record of that "ravishment into which he had entered" after his conversion (23 November, 1654), these words occur: "*Dieu d'Abraham, Dieu d' Isaac, Dieu de Jacob, non des philosophes et des savants.*"

The context of these words is to be found more or less everywhere in the *Pensées*, where Pascal incessantly sets the data of the heart against those of intellectualism. Not content with ridiculing philosophy, he loudly proclaims the practical inadequacy of theories about God. In the realm of souls, according to him, the order of the world and of all its grandeurs, and all the argument drawn from it, are only secondary, mere intellectual and verbal illustrations of the Divine work. In the foreground, but shrouded from the eyes of the proud, our God displays Himself "much more recognizable when He is invisible than when He has made Himself visible". This is not "the God of geometrical truths", but "a God of love and of consolation", from Whom proceed the supremest grandeurs of the interior life.

So that Deism, which is in reality an advance upon the denial of God, seemed to Pascal retrograde and impious. He maintained that a Christian ought to abhor the Intellectualist Theodicy "almost as much as Atheism itself".

This discredit was justified at that time by the special poverty of the proofs propounded by the philosophers.

Some put forth entirely empirical demonstrations, ill supported by science. Molière has placed the principal one, the proof from finality, in the mouth of Sganarelle, in the Third Act of *Don Juan*. And when he did this, I am afraid he was mocking God as well as his audience. Others, like Descartes and his disciples, were expounding a dry, abstract Intellectualism, of a purely ideological kind impotent to convince any but those who were already convinced.

To confine ourselves to the latter category, let us remember that the whole of Descartes' theodicy hung upon the *innate idea* of the Perfect. The author of the *Discourse on Method* reasoned thus: From the fact that we possess the idea of an infinite, perfect being, above whom there is no other, it becomes *necessary*, from that very fact, that this perfect and infinite Being should exist. Voltaire, the master of irony, in his drama, *Les Systèmes*, where he burlesques all the schools of philosophy, dragging them before the Throne of the Supreme Being, does not fail to put this famous argument into verse:

> "Here is my great argument, it seems to me invincible,—
> "For you to be, it is enough that you should just
> be possible."

And he adds, in a note, somewhat expanding Descartes' thought, "It must be confessed that all these abstract reasonings are rather useless, as most heads do not understand them, and those who understand something of them do not feel thereby any more convinced."

Taking into account the difference of the two souls, this is pretty much what Pascal thinks: "These are exceedingly involved reasons, too remote from the ordinary way of men's reasoning.—If these should serve for the moment in which they see this demonstration, an hour after they would be afraid they had been mistaken."

And Pascal adds, in a tone of discouragement: "If there is a God, He is infinitely beyond comprehension."

My readers will understand that I am not dwelling

upon these theories, since they are not the object of my study. But the old Spiritualists, one cannot but note, have made the task difficult for those who are earnest about the rational defence of the belief in God. The reading of Descartes, of Malebranche, of Leibnitz has produced more doubters and hesitaters than the reading of Lucretius. To spiritualize all questions, to make a rule of transposing them into terms of ideas, to apply to them only the formal processes of deduction, to render them of themselves practically unverifiable,—what singular folly! Nothing could more surely chill the ardent impulse of thinkers towards these lofty problems.

Criticism has long been paralyzed—as it were, stalled—in the midst of the indelible prejudices created by these failures. It has become usual to deny to Spiritualism—"an otherwise noble and subtile theory", says William James—all demonstrative value. "It has no hold upon reality", says one. "It is not in the scale we have chosen",—"It only slashes the water with a sword". . . —"It is a very antiquated sort of rhetorical exercise . . . "—"It is a religion, not a philosophy. . ."—"It is a piece of logic substituted for the movement of life . . . "—"An arbitrary notion", say others. In short, it is spoken of with the impertinence and disdain with which one treats the old-fashioned devotional ideas of a past age.

One school alone could not afford to cease taking this argument into account—that school, namely, which still teaches its conclusions in churches and seminaries in all their rigour: the Catholic school.

We shall see that its representatives in France have been able to re-arrange these dogmatic notions and infuse a new life into them. Still more, whether religious persecution and daily contradictions have awakened, reactively, the spirit of research, or whether the arguments and theories against the Divinity are beginning visibly to exhaust their venom, or whether—and this is

worth noting—our Catholic philosophers, by sheer ability, are making themselves better heard, the Intellectualist theodicy is now producing quite a different effect upon minds of the right kind, a thoroughly satisfactory impression.

I

Common Sense and Theodicy

One point on which people seem to be coming together is, that common knowledge is better off for correct data on this matter than the speculative philosophies. In this sense the criticisms of Pascal and of Voltaire have borne fruit.

P. Garrigou-Lagrange above all has insisted on pointing out the sound foundation of this rudimentary philosophy, this spontaneous dogmatic. His book, *Le Sens Commun, la Philosophie de l'Etre, et les Formules dogmatiques*,[1] is not only an eloquent plea, full of sagacious and ingenious apologetic, it is *an objective construction* which is very imposing. According to him, common sense in fact offers itself as possessing in a confused way the certain solutions of the great problems, solutions which everybody understands in a general way, and which carry a sort of irresistible evidence for everyone. Thus common sense admits matter and spirit, the soul and the body, the necessary and the contingent, duty and pleasure, God and the world. It reconciles these terms without confounding them; it admits a distinction of orders between them while believing in mysterious relations at the points where they touch. Do not tempt it by offering it some exclusive thesis under a favourable light where it will sacrifice the one to the other; it will resist the temptation. It is protected by an instinct. Common sense is not prone to heresy: it is neither Materialist, nor Idealist, nor Mechanist nor Hylozoist; neither Empiricist nor Rationalist; neither Intellectualist nor Fideist; neither

[1] Paris, Beauchesne, 117 Rue de Rennes.

Pantheist nor Dualist. Rather, it condemns at one time all these artificial philosophies, these veritable debauches of the mind by which we twist ourselves aside from the truth and put theories in its place. Everyone agrees that it is better to know nothing at all than to have one's mind filled with "one's own ideas", always seeking confirmation for them, turning aside everything not connected with them. This view is the view of common sense.

On the other hand, we need not expect to see common sense pick up any opinion, right or wrong, let it only be pleasant and fashionable. Common sense is the result of a slow elaboration of the human mind. In the admirable saying of Socrates, it is "the basis of intercourse among men", as it were, a kind of doctrinal residuum on which candid men have little by little come to an agreement, and which is the same in all minds.

As an example of truths unanimously admitted by common sense, P. Garrigou-Lagrange cites the conclusions of Mgr. Leroy's book, *Religion des Primitifs*. Having himself lived for many years among savages, Mgr. Leroy has compared their different religions, and eliminated whatever distinguishes one group from another; he has thus obtained a residuum of common elements, which is like the foundation of the common Theodicies. The detail of it is remarkable: (1) A distinction between the visible and the invisible world. (2) A sense in man of dependence in presence of this superior world. (3) Belief in a Supreme Being, above other gods, more or less the creator and organizer of this world. (4) Belief in independent spirits, some tutelary, others hostile. (5) Belief in the human soul, more or less roughly distinguished from the body, conscious, surviving after death. (6) A universal moral sense founded on the distinction between good and evil. (7) A sentiment of modesty, justice, responsibility, liberty, duty. (8) Prescriptions and proscriptions in view of a

moral, or reputed moral, end. (9) The notion of sin with a sanction applied either on earth or in the other world. (10) A cultural organization, a priesthood, prayers, sacrifices. (11) Distinction of the profane and the sacred. (12) Establishment of the family as a religious and social centre. . .[2]

What is the bearing of this species of infallibility which belongs to the common sense? P. Garrigou-Lagrange, like all the Intellectualists, answers: "That the human intelligence may of itself lay hold upon Being; *Objectum intellectus est ens.*" Descartes had reduced knowledge to the consciousness of thought. That opened the way for all the subjectivist theses down to, and including, those of Kant. The common sense of men passes beyond the subjective data; it affirms Being objectively. It pronounces to itself that Being is, not because it thinks it, but that it thinks it because it is. Ask a storekeeper if this ribbon is really a metre long, and he will answer: I am sure it is; I have measured it. So invincibly confident is he of the objective reality of his affirmation.

In the same way, common sense, after affirming the particular, affirms the general and the universal. It has quickly grasped something stable beneath the flux of events, in the diverse representations which it possesses of the datum of common characteristics, it perceives features which repeat themselves, and, in the linking together of the phenomena [it perceives] *constants*, as we say in mathematics. This begets in the cognizant subject the idea—at first a mere hypothesis and then a well-established conviction—that the variations of the

[2] Paris, Beauchesne, 1909. This is not the place to ask how this amalgam was produced. The Sociologic school believed it had discovered in this a sort of social consensus imposed upon the individual by the collective sense. One may see what P. de Grandmaison has replied to this in *Le Développement du Dogme*, and the Abbé Georges Michelet in *Dieu et l'Agnosticisme*. Like P. Garrigou-Lagrange, I have omitted to notice anything except the fact of the religious consensus taken in itself.

phenomena are determined by strict universal relations. Is this itself an arbitrary view, an illusion? The anti-Intellectualists endeavour to prove it so. But science disavows them. Day after day science carries out millions of experiments which establish to the contrary the presentiment of common sense on this point, and justify it. How refuse to believe the intelligibility of things, and the efficacy of reason, when we see the wonderful unfolding of civilization upon our globe? Was it not our faith in the first principles—in identity, sufficient reason, causality, finality, induction—that enabled us to regulate and exploit our domain? From each principle, each law, however inadequate its verbal expression, consequences have emerged which have opened to the mind new possibilities, and enabled it to derive greater results from its toil, by which I mean, more of reality—more of *being*. When Archimedes discovered the formula of the lever, he did not foresee all the machines which have been invented upon his principle. But these machines have been derived from it, and the life of humanity has been renewed thereby. Here we have a brusque reply, as to the principle set forth, to the whole of agnosticism. And so for the others.

Besides, all the ideas which constitute the essential part of our sciences and our metaphysic—quantity, quality, attribution, causality,—as well as the moral postulates referred to above, are precisely the bond of union between men by which they understand each other. In spite of time, in spite of distance, the same fundamental ways of thinking, feeling and acting are everywhere evident, and serve for intellectual exchange between individuals who are socially most different from one another.

Such are the guarantees of the certitude of common sense which are invoked by the Intellectualists. It is almost superfluous to remark on the difficulties opposed to them. The Pragmatists, notably, maintain that "practical utility", the value of common sense in action, not

its theoretic value, is confirmed here. As instinct is made out of the organs which are at its service, so the social man is made out of the implements at his service. His most practicable implement, his master-key, must be common sense.

The part played by fancy in the invention of this hypothesis is the same that we find everywhere in the work of these philosophers. They possess the dexterity of prestidigitators. They make things produce the very opposite of what one would expect, the opposite of what one would normally find in them. Thus, when we look for the things of the intellect in the things of sense, they are seeking the things of sense in the objects of the intellect—when we are separating mind from matter, they are extracting matter from mind—while we are giving the chief place to *being*, they are preaching about the future,—and so on. Here it is the same paradoxical proceedings, they are substituting the useful for the true.

To which the Intellectualists, with P. Garrigou-Lagrange, make answer: "This is turning the settled conditions of the agreement upside down." Hitherto we had been seeking to know in order to act, because we believed that one must think rightly in order to act well, and now they come and tell us that truth is the consequence, not the cause, of the success of action. For our part, we prefer the horse before the cart. An idea is not right because it succeeds, it succeeds because it is right. And to apply this to our subject, the aims of common sense do not borrow their truth from their practical success; they have no success except because they are true, that is, conformable at least in some measure to reality, to *being*. Sometimes, to be sure, haphazard intuition puts a scientist upon the track of a discovery, nevertheless it cannot be denied that most often it is the theory that originates the practice. It is not the workshop that creates the laboratory.

II

Science for the Service of Theodicy.

This being so, the Intellectualists, to lift themselves to God, will lean upon the usual data of science.

God, an intelligible reality, is attained by the same process which serves for all intelligible realities. The spirit raises itself from the domain of the senses to the metaphysical domain by the same effort, and pursuing the same method as in regard to God, the soul, or the world. Mgr. d'Hulst, opening a course of theodicy at the Institut Catholique of Paris, in 1881, was already loudly proclaiming it: "Undertaking a rational demonstration of the existence of God," he said, "I confidently make use of the principles of reason, the value of which in other domains is not questioned by anyone." Since Mgr. d'Hulst our Catholic philosophers have done their best to strengthen this confidence, especially the Abbé Clodius Piat, the Abbé Sertillanges, P. Gardeil, Georges Fonsegrive, Georges Michelet, P. Bernard Allo, X. Moisant and, more recently, M. Maritain.

How shall we use these data? It is a good thing, says M. Piat, to consider the traditional proofs as different stages in one and the same demonstration, one and the same ascent of the soul towards the Absolute. Imagine a supposed peak towards which one climbs by a series of paths. Each one of these gives us opportunity to take in one of its aspects, but we cannot have any impression of it as a whole until after studying all of these images. There is something analogous to this in the proofs upon which the natural theodicy is based. Each one of them opens upon the Eternal, presenting it to us in perspective, but only on one side. They have the fulness of their significance only for him who has grouped them as in a bundle; then it is that one obtains that knowledge of the First Cause which the human mind can have.[3]

[3] *La Croyance en Dieu*, Paris, Alcan, p. 35.

Causality.

First of all, here is the cosmological proof. It is venerable and is worth presenting. Everybody knows the arrangement of it and how to handle it.

We know no example of a being which comes of itself. We know only beings which proceed from other beings. The world, therefore, proceeds from some being other than itself. And why is this Being in its turn of itself and not of some other being? Because, says Aristotle, in the Second Book of the Metaphysics, "it is impossible that one thing should come from another *ad* infinitum. We reach a point where we must stop—ἀνάγχη στῆναι." We then discover God, Who is this uncaused Cause.

Indeed every one of our Intellectualists follows his own propensities in the development of the proof. M. Piat is an agile and spirited dialectician, he pursues the detractors of causality, especially Kant, with the utmost vigour. P. Garrigou-Lagrange, an applied-metaphysician—shall I say, a subtile one?—sets forth upon a severe discussion about the First Principle, essaying to bring things down to the simplest formula,—A is A,—the formula of the principle of identity, the nerve and essence of the argument. He thus develops that the world, which is subject to change, contingent, in a state of flux, cannot of itself posit itself. For what changes *becomes*, and the becoming *is not*. To affirm that the becoming posits itself is to admit that it is sufficient to posit A in order to have not-A—an absurd formula in itself, since *becoming* cannot give *being*. On the contrary, God, the necessary Being, is of Himself, and is without cause. This is evident; the necessary is necessary, the *Being* is, A is A.

The Abbé Sertillanges, no less a good Thomist, is a more eloquent man, an adroit writer. He develops the proof in a savoury style.

"I understand that beings move each other; that they are set in action one by another; that if the sailor carries an anchor on board,

the ship carries the sailor, the wave carries the ship, the earth the wave, the sun the earth, and some unknown centre the sun. But after that? . . . One cannot go on in causes to infinity. . . Multiply intermediary causes as much as you will, you are complicating the instrument, but you are not fabricating a cause; you are lengthening the canal, you are not finding a source."

Or thus,

"Are you going to say that a paint brush can paint all by itself, provided its handle is very long? The length of the handle makes no difference, what does matter is the hand."

At the source of all causality, then, of all transmitted activity, we must suppose a First Act, a First Cause, whence flows the actuation of all acts, the efficacy of all causes.[4]

Let us say that the question here is not as to a series of causes succeeding each other in duration of time, or of a prime mover pushed back to the beginning of the ages and giving what Descartes has called the initial fillip to the universe; but of a Cause, a Being, which continually, at every instant, gives to all things their being and their activity. For this world really has no being except by participation. What religion proclaims, namely that we depend from God, that we owe Him all that we are, is a truth of metaphysics before it is a truth of the moral order. If God infinitely surpasses our phenomenal existence by His essence, we are nevertheless bound to Him more closely than to a brother or a friend. He is more intimate in us than our own *ego*, more present than the causes which formed us, body and soul. He is our Law, as He is the Law of the Universe.[5]

There is a trick to be made in the objections against the Intellectualists upon God considered as the First Cause. I will, here again, dwell only upon those of the Pragmatists, the most suggestive both for what there is in them and for the replies made to them.

The Intellectualists are asked, how, having affirmed

[4] *Les Sources de la Croyance en Dieu.* Paris, Perrin, p. 65.
[5] *Le Sens Commun*, loc. cit., pp. 145–152—See also Maritain's commentaries in *Philosophie Bergsonienne*, p. 144.

only *being*, they explain *the future*. Granted that being produces being; also, that there is here an affirmation of the same kind as St. Anselm's, and that the cosmologic proof then reduces to the ontologic, the weakness of which we know. But that which is becoming cannot proceed from the Unmoved Being. The contingent is in no way necessary, and could not come from the Necessary. Whence *does* it come? And, having put the question in such a way as to persuade those who listen to them that the Intellectualists have denatured the problem, instead of solving it, the Pragmatists expound their own solution:

"Nothing is, everything is becoming. . . As there is always something new in the world, it would be impossible to catch *being* in a state of repose, in a purely static state. . . We are irremediably in the unfinished, in the eternal transitory. . . It is, therefore, *becoming* which is the *datum*, not *being*. . . Whence it follows that movement needs no course, nor the movable any mover. . . Things being movement, there is no more need to ask ourselves how they move."

Whether the argument be presented by M. Bergson, M. Blondel, or M. Le Roy, the vesture alone differs, the body is the same. On the contrary, I always admire here the diversity of the replies made here by the Intellectualists.

M. Piat defends himself by attacking.

"You affirm *becoming* as the first thing, but the *becoming* is indeterminate, at most a tendency. Now, how can a tendency predetermine action, this action rather than that? . . . What is an end which determines its own means? . . . This does not satisfy me. I wish to have it explained why the world, which is a *real* thing, can have proceeded from a possible thing. . . Besides, I do not admit that the possible is a tendency. For it would be a tendency towards what? . . . To reason like this supposes an understanding that *being* is in *becoming*, intelligence in chaos, the necessary in the contingent. So then this is stealing its truth from Intellectualism, at the same time that you repudiate Intellectualism."[6]

P. Garrigou-Lagrange on his part thinks the difficulty illusory. If the Pragmatists have read Aristotle, they have misunderstood him. He did not portion out the real in two slices, *being* here, and *becoming* there. It was the Bergsonians who made these slicings, they who, for

[6] *La Croyance en Dieu*, pp. 76–90.

polemical convenience, isolate *becoming* from *being*, so as to deny *being* in favour of *becoming*. Aristotle indeed maintains that, if *becoming* does not include *being*, *being* does include *becoming*, as the cause potentially includes the effect. Potentiality is a mean between the act and mere nothing; from one point of view it is, and from another point of view it is not. Potentiality is not the act, and, from that point of view, it is not. But potentiality is said *to be* by comparison with nothing, which will never be, being the absolute *not-being*. And thereupon our author shows that the Intellectualist theory is a middle way between Parmenides and Heraclitus, avoiding the extremes of both. According to Parmenides there is only *being*, according to Heraclitus there is only *becoming*. Which is right? Neither; for *becoming* is supposed as against Parmenides, and *being*, against Heraclitus. Only one solution is possible: *becoming* is in some way in *being*.

Thus, between *being* and *becoming* there is a continuity, *being* little by little unfolding, in duration of time, that which it includes. We will say to the Pragmatists, then, that there is no repose, no immobility except for our senses; as for the intelligence, *being* is and at the same time becomes.[7]

It is to be well understood that we are here only dealing with beings-by-participation, with *second causes* as we say. These are those which form this mixture of being and becoming, and are stuffed full of potentialities. As for the first Being, who is pure Act, we repeat that, remaining in conformity with Himself, He cannot change. From Him movement and life go forth, without His life evolving, or His movement progressing.

At bottom the Pragmatists know it as well as you and I. But I believe that they keep up the cry through false shame. How should they fall into agreement with the vulgar? How should they make penetrating and subtile

[7] *Le Sens Commun*, l. c., pp. 107–112.

books just to declare, like decently-opinioned *bourgeois*, "that the world did not make itself all by itself"? M. Maritain and P. de Tonquedec forbear to affirm it.[8] They pierce the psychology of their adversaries and recognize their *pensée de derrière*. And in it they find all the shams of prejudice. For what must we think of the hazardous and truly desperate affirmations into which the agnostics throw themselves in order to avoid confessing a first Cause at the origin of things? Aristotle said, "It is impossible for one thing to come from another *ad infinitum*." They answer: "Is it really necessary to stop; why should not the series of causes be infinite?"—If *becoming* is the essence of the Universe, and this *becoming* did not *begin*, then the Universe is eternal? They answer: "Why not?" —But this *becoming* which determines itself, and actualizes itself by itself, gives itself what, by hypothesis, it does not possess, and we can say, then, *What is not, is?* They answer: "The principle of identity to which you appeal is a mere prejudice of the reasoning faculty." One of them writes, "a sin of the reason".—You must confess that the effect is here out of proportion to the cause, surpasses it infinitely. They reply: "Cause and effect are only symbols—abbreviated signs—by which we jot down our impressions about nature."—There are then no categories any more, no axioms in which we may trust. They answer: "The human mind is plastic, it changes its axioms and its categories."—Then this world has no *raison d'être*, we look in vain for a *Why?* They answer: "The world has no need of a *Why*."—But you do know the world in a certain manner, how do you represent it to yourself? They answer: "I know it only as I make it; the world is the work of our mind."—Science protests against such a position. Besides, it only makes any way because it properly applies laws, categories, axioms, postulates, causality, induction and the rest.

[8] M. Maritain in *Philosophie Bergsonienne*, Paris, Rivière, pp. 150–170. P. Tonquedec in *Immanence*, Paris, Beauchesne, p. 65.

They reply: "Science is only the caricature of reality." —After all, your principle, pushed to its limits, brings us to deny the very possibility of knowledge. They answer: "Perhaps we in fact have no knowledge."[9]

"These", says M. Maritain, "are exaggerated explanations" and a manner of "thinking contrary to nature". And for his part P. de Tonquedec concludes: "Here we are invited to let go of what our reason holds firmly, to throw away our certitudes, largely verified, on the pretext that they will some day be given back to us transfigured in some metaphysical system or other." But of this metaphysic we at present know only one thing:—it is "the counterpoise of common sense"; and it is repugnant to us to accept it.

Finality.

Let us now come to the proof of finality. The God of the Agnostics—for after all there is in the Universe an X whom they call by that name—is essentially movable and moving. He has no intelligence,[10] that "august and holy intelligence" Plato claimed for Him; consequently He has no providence,[11] He creates without having any plan,[12] leaving to that which becomes the care of inventing by good luck, if I dare say so, and as evolution progresses, the fitting solutions.[13]

For Intellectualists, it is known, on the contrary, that a basic article of their theodicy is the affirmation of finality, of order,—the belief in a plan of the Universe willed and executed by God.

This thesis, professed by the most opposite schools, down to Gassendi, and imposing by the number of its

[9] Americans will recognize these theories. Professed in France by the Bergsonians, they are professed in America by the disciples of Dewey, in Chicago.

[10] *L'Evolution créatrice*, by M. Bergson, p. 283, Paris, Alcan.

[11] *L'Evolution créatrice*, by M. Bergson, l. c., p. 270.

[12] l. c., p. 112.

[13] l. c., p. 270; see Maritain, l. c., p. 178.

illustrious witnesses, was, however, for long only a theme of oratory, one of those *vérités d'apparat* to which no one ever thought of giving any other support, because it carries with it the general adhesion.

But since Newton it has gained all the credit which a spontaneous, instinctive notion gains when it is suddenly confirmed by mathematics. Socrates and the Stoics, the Epicureans and the Spiritualists, considered it very likely that there is somewhere a regulating will which organized the Cosmos. This conclusion they founded upon analogy. Seeing harmonies in man, relations of means to end, witnessing the regularity of sequences, the fixity of types, they decided for order as against chaos, for determinism rather than hazard. Now this is in truth what Newton scientifically justifies.

"From the fall of a body upon the earth", says Voltaire, "M. Newton thought he could infer the fall of the planets upon a central star according to the same law"; which in due course led him to think, "that the physical laws which hold on the surface of the earth hold equally in the entire universe". Truly a rule of gold, a *regula philosophandi;* for "the properties belonging to all bodies on which we can make experiments must be considered as properties of all bodies in general". . . "In virtue of this rule we learn that all bodies gravitate to one another mutually."—And Newton concluded to a general solidarity of the worlds, a certain physical and chemical conformity of their component matter, a certain kinetic bond between them, etc.—views which are in reality perfectly objective, since they have enabled us to establish other laws and a whole science of the world's which is still in continual progress.

This note of confidence in the reasoning faculty and its inductive processes has been, since Newton, evident in all men of sciences. They do not all soar so high as Newton, they do not all, as he did, affirm God the Creator. But this is for different reasons into which I will not

enter here, it is not because they doubt the finality of the world's order. With what minuteness of detail, on the contrary, do they establish it! What rich documentation is theirs!

What was formerly affirmed *en bloc*, and in a quite didactic way, is now offered to us in categories and according to the framework of reality;—(a) *Order of Selection:* Nature seems to have eliminated some elements and selected others. The molecule is a system of atoms, but not of any atoms whatever. In the same way, a fact is a conjunction and co-operation of lesser facts, but not of any facts whatever. "Bear in mind", says M. Henri Poincairé, "that milliards of them are produced in a millimetre of our body, and that in a few hours just as many will be produced again, both others and the same. Whence is it that Nature has chosen some to the exclusion of others?". . . (b) *Order of Structure:* Nature builds; she groups, assembles, combines. Now the existence of the infinitesimal elements which enter into these compositions, and still more the existence of the group, would be precarious, "if we did not know that a combination of movements incessantly pushes them one towards the other, and makes them gravitate in some way round a common end."[14] These elements tend to unification. . . And this structure lasts. The same functional mechanism shows the same aptitude to reproduce the same acts. The functions of the species, among living beings, of themselves transmit themselves organically identical.—(c) *Order of sequence:* Consider the unfolding of facts. It is produced by series, and these series are so fixed that, given one, the other invariably follows. The certitude here is such that a single fact may be considered as the summary of a law. At the same time the repetition of nature is so untiring that the laws suggest the facts, without our having to wait for them. . . In truth, the reciprocal accord of all the parts of nature, as Newton has

[14] *Le fondement de l'Induction*, by M. Lachelier, p. 81, Paris, Alcan.

explained, "can only result from their respective dependence in regard to the whole". It follows, therefore, that in nature "the idea of the whole preceded and determined the existence of the parts".[15] In one word, Nature must be subject to a plan, and put into action according to certain intentional endowments, the work of the Spirit.

But a scruple occurs to the philosopher: Can he put aside without examination the hypothesis of hazard? This notion, as we know, has always been associated with the image of finality like its shadow. Hazard is one of the forms of contingency, and apparently one aspect of disorder. But suppose, nevertheless, that it should have some more positive part to play in the world?

Hereupon French Spiritualism has the honour of presenting the most pointed reply, in the works of one of its adepts, a man of unquestioned scientific authority. Cournot, carrying on the researches upon hazard and probability where they were left off by Leibnitz, after Fermat, Pascal, and Jacques Bernouilli, explains that the organization of the world by hazard is "mathematically impossible".[16]

The reader will dispense with my giving any more than the skeleton of the proof.

In mathematical language, says Cournot, the probability that the universe may have fallen by chance upon its actual order for the whole and for the details cannot be represented by a fraction;[17] for "the single chance of which we are speaking among an infinity of opposite chances is not numerically evaluable". Let us imagine the immense number of the atoms, and the infinite number of combinations which they must try before meeting with the actual state of the universe. This total number of possible combinations is altogether incommensurable.

[15] Ibid., p. 82.

[16] *Théorie des chances et des probabilités*, Paris, Hachette, 1843. See also *Cournot*, by Mentré, Paris, Rivière, pp. 155 to 163.

[17] We know that every probability is represented by a fraction. If I have one chance in ten, I have $\frac{1}{10}$ of a chance.

In these conditions the probability becomes less than any fraction, however small. Indeed such a chance is rightly considered a physical impossibility. The formula, *one over infinity*, is practically equal to zero. The partisans of hazard may take any side they choose; they can never, to prove their thesis, find support in the calculus.

As to the infinity of time which would render this fortuitous accident at least logically possible, given the infinite number of occasions for forming the union which the atoms have had, Cournot says that here again science has a peremptory answer to give. "The condition of an unlimited time is wanting to the species. They are born, live and disappear in very little time." And every day we see living beings appear whose organization is effected under our eyes. These living creatures would each need on its own account "the totality of chances" while these chances, by definition, cannot come together or, above all, become connected. How can hazard, which did not succeed in an unlimited time in bringing about the evolution of these organisms, succeed in doing so in a very short time, in the shortest time? A fly is born this morning, it lives a whole day, it dies this evening. What a deal of work for chance in such a little time! so much so, that it must be the most skillful of workmen, if it brings the affair to a successful issue.

Moreover, it is a matter of succeeding not with one being but with all beings, not once, but always; not in one detail, but in all details. Then how could chance, which would not succeed once, succeed every time?

Thus the calculus of probabilities dissipates the hypothesis which explains the world by chance, defining what that hypothesis demands.

It must not be imagined, however, that we Spiritualists understand the Final Cause in a narrow sense. The Abbé Sertillanges, in his *Sources de la Croyance en Dieu*, makes a powerful attack upon a method which would tend to "transform the world into a *cour des miracles* where noth-

ing comes to pass but by instantaneous strokes, by sudden decisions, by repeated interventions of Providence". On his part, the Abbé Bouyssonie, a learned paleontologist, has expounded, in some famous studies in the *Revue du Clergé français*,[18] the position that, in widening the circle of action of natural forces, we are, so far from lessening the action of God, making it "more one and more august", without "rendering it less necessary".

We have, in the theory of power and of second causes, laid down above the principle of this collaboration of created beings in the work of the Creator.

According to the Thomistic tendency, the activity of causes is so real, so boldly productive, that "whenever there is any change, something real is born or perishes",[19] and bodies, when they produce other bodies, draw or educe (*educunt*) from the power of pre-existing matter the form of a really new being. Certain philosophers, particularly Malebranche, have even been scandalized by this last theory, which, in their eyes, conferred a creative power upon creatures; this is false, for in the same teaching an efficient cause is never efficacious by itself, and always has God for its support. But it is none the less true that Intellectualism has thus opened wide perspectives upon evolution. This, in fact, renders possible some—even profound—transformations of matter and of life by the mere unfolding, in duration of time, of the potentialities of being. It is enough that the efficient cause should be relatively autonomous for it to bring into the world a negation of variety and originality, and renew species and types in the medium where it exercises its powers.

We can imagine, *e.g.*, certain areas determined by God, in which the energies of this world may evolve unconstrainedly, manifesting a suppleness, a plasticity, a prodigality of means comparable to the richness of the initial

[18] *Revue du Clergé français*, 15 August, 1910; 15 September, 1911, Paris, Letouzey.

[19] *Philosophie Bergsonienne*, p. 491. And St. Thomas, *Quaest. disp., de pot.*, q. 3, a.s.

action. It seems, then, that evolution comes about in series. One series corresponds to one complete order of realities. All that is of this order will not call for any special intervention of God; on the contrary, the Divine intervention will be required for the higher order, which is not realizable without it. And so on. There is a corresponding new stage of the world to each addition from on High. Spirits come after bodies. The Christian, a subject of grace, comes after man; he is the super-man, that is, man + something. The elect will follow, the last and supreme form of being, into which life, thought, grace and glory will all melt, in one unspeakable unity. When Pascal defines "the three orders", matter, spirit, and charity, he marks the limits where the finality of each series stops, and the point where God, by His free will, intervenes.

It is not of faith that things proceed thus. That, indeed, is neither demonstrated nor truly demonstrable. But we can judge that a greater multiplicity of Divine interventions would be useless, according to the adage: *Frustra fit per plura quod fieri potest per pauciora.*

However that may be, all our Intellectualists agree upon one point, which is the only important one: The Sovereign Thought, which is the cause of the world, is at the same time its end. It is that which has produced Nature, which has portioned out *being* to the creatures it includes, which has fixed the laws and the stages of their evolution, has determined the rhythm of their movements, and draws them towards it across the vicissitudes of time. All this is perceptible to the reason, as it is to common sense. While causality *proves* God, it is agreed upon as right to say that finality *indicates* Him.

III

The Heart and Theodicy

But is not God also perceptible to the heart?—Since Pascal, it has been affirmed with singular energy. And we do not suppose that it can be denied.

At the same time we, here again, touch precisely one of those forms of vertigo which is now-a-days beguiling so many minds to look for light either below, or too high above, that region where the light of reason shines. To listen to some philosophers one would say it was not so much a matter of discovering a superabundance of proofs in our own senses as of destroying the proofs derived from our understanding. The theodicy of the heart is very specially one of reprisals.

It already possessed this character, as we remember, in the time of Pascal; but this has since been accentuated. When Pascal said, "The heart has its own movements, movements of charity which are above the highest thought . . . the heart has its own reasons", he not only established that there are gifts of instinct, which enable us to judge of things offhand,—this we ourselves say of common sense; but he thinks that he is establishing the proposition that the heart reaches truth which is inaccessible to the mind, the reality denied to the faculty of cognition. Push on in this direction, and you come to Cardinal Newman, who also, having got rid of the reasoning reason [*la raison raisonnante*] leans upon certain "presumptions, prepossessions of truth". No doubt he finds for them an infinite co-efficient of certitude. For a moment, reading him, one would think that these intuitions are more objective than the dogmas. He does not say so, of course, and how could he, since he believes in the dogmas with all his heart? But after him, it will be said, taking advantage of his authority.

The content of this theodicy of the heart comes to this: the belief in God is, as it were, the satisfaction of an infused need, like the answer waited for, or looked for, to aspirations, to interior appeals, like the complement of the *ego*, which, without God, is void and disenchanted. . . But to grasp this elusive thing, let us have recourse to ourselves only, we must shut ourselves up tight from all that is from without. Above all, no words. Language is

a great imperfection. It isolates, it breaks up, it crystallizes the gift given. It is an artificial thing. One can reach the Transcendance only by the path of immanence, by practice and action. . . All the proofs of the existence of God result from the total of the interior life. Action alone has a power which constrains us to believe. To believe in God is to live God in oneself. More than this, metaphysics itself has no truth but under this experimental and dynamic aspect. If the Intellectualists wish to escape psittacism, let them firmly take their stand, like us, in immanence and melt all their proofs in the fire of love. For knowledge is dead or alive accordingly as the being, whose necessary presence it carries in it, is a mere dead weight in it or reigns in it by the effect of a free adherence.

What answer does Intellectualism make?

It answers with all serenity, pointing out that the aspirations of the human heart and the postulates of action constitute one of the most characteristic verifications of the proof from finality.

The Abbé Sertillanges devotes one-third of his work already quoted[20] to this proof. It is evident, he explains, that desire represents in the intelligent being the same thing as instinct in the sensitive being, the same thing as blind tendency in the being lacking knowledge. Nature assigns to each being a curve to be traversed, and an end to be attained; it prepares it in accordance with this, gives the projectile and provides the impulse. In man the projectile is the being, the impulse is the desire of infinity. A hunger never appeased, an aspiration never satisfied are the proof that God is working on us within us, and is keeping us, as it were, breathless. Man is seeking after God in the same measure as he is seeking after happiness. Moreover, the School will say magnificently that all desire, in so far as it is the desire of a good, is a tendency to assimilate something of the Divine beatitude. And on the other hand, only God, Who draws

[20] *Les sources de la croyance en Dieu*, pp. 328–430.

everything to Him, can fill this desire of infinity. Whence these aphorisms: To the will in general there corresponds a good in general; to the will, taken in its desire of the infinite, there corresponds an infinite good.[21]

M. Piat, who takes up the argument in his *Destinée de l'homme*, and comes back to it in his *Morale du Bonheur*[22] gives it the form of a scientific instance. We have no right to consider finality as a legitimate explanation in biology and the physico-chemical sciences, if we arbitrarily stop on the threshold of ethics and of theodicy. In biology, an organic function once observed, the question is no longer to find if it has an object, but what is the nature of that object. Well, in man we have desires, aspirations, great spiritual currents, what is it that sets them in motion?

"Nothing", says one materialist.

"Nothing?"

"It is an hallucination", says another.

"What? A collective hallucination?"

"Yes."

Thus nature would have succeeded in its most diverse adaptations, but there would have been one *terrain*, only one, where it would have failed, that is, the spiritual man. So far there would have been plan, direction, harmony, equilibrium, adaptation; finality would be triumphant, (1) in our different physiological equipments, the eye adapted to vision, the ear to sound, the muscles to movement, the glands to secretion, (2) in the service of our instincts—to drink, to eat, to run, to procreate, etc. But on the threshold of our higher ideas and aspirations, just *because* here is the culmination of the being, is finality to come to a sharp stop? Is reason to be right everywhere except in what touches the highest reasons of living?

[21] See also "*Dieu et l'Agnosticisme*" by Georges Michelet, Paris, Gabalda, pp. 236, 254, 263, 267; and "*Dieu et l'Expérience*" by X. Moissant, pp. 109–126.

[22] Paris, Alcan.

Why this rending asunder of logic, this break in the general determinism?

Lastly, who is there of our Spiritualists but has reproduced on this subject those admirable pages of M. Lachelier on "the waiting organs" [*organes d'attente*] which evidence in man a nature pre-harmonized to eternal things?

"Reason and liberty manifestly pass the bounds of our actual conscience: they are in us the idea, partly determined, the half-empty frame of a spiritual life which is only very imperfectly realized in this world and could be much better realized in another if, all the sensible elements of consciousness having disappeared, the matter of the intellectual acts became adequate to their form. That this higher life should be possible is what we must not doubt, since it is only the eventual specification of a genus the existence of which we grasp in ourselves. In fact we are ceaselessly aspiring to it, and it inspires in us the motives of conduct which makes us greater in our own eyes. We can believe, then, that our higher faculties are destined to find, in another order of existence, an object adequate to them, and that here below they are in a *state of provisional waiting*, like the organs of respiration during intra-uterine life."[23]

Thus Intellectualism yields nothing to Pragmatism in the utilization of the data of the heart.

But it is enlisted against the claim of the Pragmatists to base their demonstration on the moral experience alone. It is not enough, to justify the belief in God, to insist upon the appeals of the soul, upon the thirst of the infinite, the intuitions and the presentiments of the heart, the wealth of affirmations shut up in the unconscious; there is nothing in all this to prove more than that such a belief may be reasonable without being in some respects, or at least in a certain point of view, altogether rational. So far as one finds in it a confirmation of this kind, I consider it an arbitrary one. M. Albert Leclère writes,

"A minimum of metaphysics, some science, some criticism, some logic are indispensable to the apologist in order that he should be taken seriously."

And he humorously adds,

"Intellectualism demands at least this, it demands it in opposition to those who, in effect, reduce all religion to sentiment (What an

[23] *Notes sur le Pari*, Paris, Alcan, pp. 196, 197.

excess of honour for sentiment!), who bring it down to an hypothesis lived (cannot one live a false hypothesis?), and who thereby diminish equally the value of the sentiment, and the idea of the hypothesis, the concept of reason and the concept of belief."[24]

The author wrote this little book without heart, but with care to be just. It possesses a lively interest.

Still more, the demonstration by mere moral experience (of some help to us as an addition when we keep besides all the credit due to it for the reason) is quite illusory, indeed invalid, for one who has set up agnosticism as an unquestionable principle. He who has denied the value of reason could not accept a proof which, after all, supposes some very delicate transcendant arguments, among them this, in which the very principle of reason is implied: *it is necessary that the natural tendencies of a being should be satisfied.* It is comprehensible that St. Thomas should argue thus, but that an agnostic should actually claim support from the same principle—that is nonsense. In the same way, he who gets rid of causality has no right to make use of finality; for the idea of *end* is, for him, equally an "idol of the understanding".[25] He who scorns the "stiff joints of logic" cannot decently draw a conclusion like a logician; it would be illogical on his part. He would seem to believe in reasons which are condemned as reasons, and in the ideas of a criticism which is in fact fatal to them. For the agnostic, farewell to the pleasure of persuading and of convincing. If he meddles with proving God, he can at most say: I have dreamed that God exists.

But wishing to go more easily to God, trying all roads which lead to Him, except one, is trifling with oneself. And if this one way is missed, we are left stranded, alone, isolated, darkling, obliged to ask for aid. Then it would be necessary to commence there. What does most honour to the Intellectualists is the sincerity with which they apply all the energies of the soul in order to know. According

[24] *Pragmatisme et Modernisme*, Paris, Bloud, p. 159.
[25] *La Croyance en Dieu* by M. Piat, loc. cit. p. 160.

to them, "intuitions" are summary indications which must be followed until we find some better ones; images have their value, they colour this world and make it vivid; words carve out on the surface of reality certain designs—imperfect no doubt, with the defect of limiting the vision, but these edifices of ideas help us to bring some order into chaos, to lay down base lines in science; classification is good for collecting the results acquired; intellection is good for separating the essence from it. . . The important thing is, to neglect nothing, to despise nothing within our little resources, above all when it is evident that, even so, we shall never have a thoroughly clear science of God. Theodicy, whether intuitive or discursive, is laboriously wrought out in an enigmatic twilight.

The Basic Call For the World Conference on Church Unity

By Junius B. Remensnyder, D.D., LL.D.

The Executive Committee asks me to define, as the basic call for the world conference on Church Unity, "Our Common Faith in Jesus Christ as Our God and Saviour".

Our theme suggests, first that *Christianity is a Faith.* This is because it is a Religion and not a Philosophy. Philosophies are founded upon reason, Religions upon faith. The two greatest philosophers of all time, Socrates and Kant, taught, the former, that he could not discern the unseen and future, and the other, in his *Critique of the Pure Reason,* that as to the deepest realities of truth and God it was a fallible light.

Religion requires faith because it speaks, not by human, but by divine voice. It lays claim to a Revelation. All the founders of the great world-religions have claimed this sanction. So Christianity affirms: "God, who at sundry times and in divers manners spake in time past unto the fathers by the prophets, hath in these last days spoken unto us by His Son." We are Christians, not because we hold a philosophical or ethical system founded upon reason and morals, but because we believe a faith based upon the authority of revelation.

The underlying theme of the world's history is the conflict between faith and unbelief. Says the historian Gibbon of the classic age of Reason, Philosophy and Culture: "The Roman people had ceased to believe, and the highest society of Rome was simply one of powerful animals." Forever true, then, are the words of Pascal:

"We must believe or despair." So also truly says Woodberry in his *Makers of Literature:* "The ages of Faith, Idealism and Vision of the Unseen are the ages of Power, and the ages of Skepticism, Materialism and Realism are the premonition and stiffening of death."

This had its significant historical illustration in the emptying of the churches in Germany during the prevalence of Rationalism, and the continued decadence of religion until the spiritual Francke saved the day by again uplifting the banner of the evangelical faith.

Let us keep vivid the fact that the certainty, the strength, the glory and the immeasurable appeal of Christianity lie just in this very point, that *it is a Faith* in a Revelation which opens to the soul's inner eye a vision of truth, of eternity, of God. This Faith our theme justly calls a "common" one, for it is holding to and confessing its essentials, as recorded in the Holy Scriptures, that alone gives us the right to call ourselves Christians. And, whatever modern criticism may have to say as to Scripture text, or whatever questions modern philosophers may ask, as Professor Eucken's brochure, *Can We Still be Christians?*, yet we must, with Professor Forsyth of Hampstead, England, in a letter to the speaker, take the position that the truth and will of God lie at the core of that Word, in order to call ourselves believers in, and confessors of the Christian Religion.

But what now is this "common Faith"? We answer, in the maxim of Vincentius: "It is that truth which has been believed always, everywhere, and by all", *i.e.*, the common mind or sense of the Church. Our theme correctly states it thus: "Our common Faith in Jesus Christ as our God and Saviour." That is, the primary article of our Christian faith is a belief in the *Divinity of Jesus Christ*, specifically in His divine-human personality —that He was God manifested in the flesh. This means much more than merely that His teachings were true;

but that we hold to the divinity of His Person; that He could say of Himself, "As the Father hath life in Himself, so hath He given to the Son to have life in Himself." Or, still more specifically, "I and my Father are One." And that He could therefore affirm "All authority hath been given unto me in heaven and on earth."

That Jesus Christ was thus true God as well as true man, not alone moves His followers to accept His teachings and commands as authoritative without question, but also to render to Him that *worship* which the New Testament, Josephus and the primitive writers universally accord Him. This was the view, not alone of the apostolic, but of the post-apostolic, the mediaeval, and the historic church of all time. He who holds less than this, no matter how high his reverence for Christ, does not hold the "common faith in Him as our God and Saviour", and cannot be recognized as a Christian. Even the philosopher Eucken, in the aforesaid treatise, admits this, for he not only recognizes with Sabatier, in his *Religions of Authority and of the Spirit*, that Christianity is in essence a religion of spirit and an ethical religion; but he also asserts, "The central dogma of the entire Christian system is the unification of God and man in one Person. All further dogmas follow from this central one with absolute necessity. In the development of these dogmas, there is an irresistible logic that dare not be broken off in the midst."

President Hibben well says that "true conservatism is progress without loss of essential principles". Or as Niebuhr puts it: "No present can be stable, and no future bear fruit, unless its roots be firmly fixed in the past."

So, the writer wants a Christian to be ever so progressive, provided that he does not yield this bed-rock of the true divine-human Person of Christ. And, as compromising this, surrenders the claim to be Christians, so, on the other hand, he who from his heart be-

lieves this, I can embrace as a brother-in-Christ, no matter in what other and even serious developments and interpretations of Christian doctrine I may differ from him.

Another article of the common or essential faith in Christ is that of "our Saviour". This was the primary purpose of the Incarnation, the angel of the Nativity, naming Him "Jesus, for He shall save His people from their sins". As to the method by which this salvation from sin and its direful fruit, death, was to be effected, He testified: "The Son of Man has come to give His life a ransom for many." And again, referring to His death on the cross, He said: "This is my blood of the New Testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins."

The apostolic interpretation of our Lord's teaching respecting His mission as Saviour was that it was *substitutionary*. He became incarnate that He might stand in the stead of man and endure the penalty of the sin, so that "God might be just, and yet the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus". So Peter most definitely affirms: "Who His own self bare our sins in His own body on the tree".

From this conviction the apostles deduced the doctrine of "Justification by Faith" alone and the great and effectual burden of their preaching was "Christ and Him crucified". And it was with this meaning that the cross became the universal symbol of Christendom. "As the work of one so constituted and representative of God and man, it is in nature substitutionary", says Fairbairn, in his *Place of Christ in Modern Theology*. This, as Professor Dorner states in his profound *History of Protestant Theology*, was the wand of power by which the mighty movement of Christianity succeeded. And here is touched man's deepest vital need. Professor Monier Williams, in his late book on the *History of Religion* affirms that all the religions of the East and all their bloody sacrificial rites arise from a sense of sin and a craving for deliverance

from it. It was the profound remark of Napoleon at St. Helena: "Christianity has the most beautiful and wonderful faith of any religion in its doctrine of the remission of sins, and so long as it holds this belief it will go on to conquer."

The disposition on the part of many to compromise this doctrine, in their efforts to harmonize Christian faith with reason, will not strengthen but weaken, will not save but destroy Christianity. No gospel truth so convicts man of the enormity of sin; or so sets forth the measureless love of God; or so exalts the glory of the divine wisdom and justice, as that of the propitiatory death of the Father's only Son on the cross. The sense of sin is the creation of Christianity, and the creative factor was the death of Christ. Gazing upon the cross the eternal opens, infinite depths grow visible, and, awed with holy amaze, we cry with the Apostle, "Great is the mystery of Godliness".

Further, the "common faith" of Christians is in a *risen* Saviour. Our Lord not only affirmed that when put to death and buried He would rise again, but by a mighty demonstration of power burst the bars of the grave, and "showed Himself alive by many infallible proofs", even challenging the doubting Thomas to thrust his hand into His spear-pierced side. "This is indeed the most difficult of all the Christian Articles of Faith, to believe", says the great Christian thinker Koestlin in his *Theology of Luther*, for there is "none other that is so directly contrary to our own experience and the appearance of things". He then, however, adds that "it is remarkably prefigured in nature. That God is everywhere in our fields and gardens, in the green summer which He brings back again out of the dead summer, in the coming forth of the bird from the dead and motionless egg, displaying such infinite power, that we should not doubt that the same Almighty Word which called forth the universe out of nothing can even resuscitate the dead."

This is not merely a continued life of the soul, but includes the entire personality, soul and body. As, however, the spirit will be renovated and glorified, so will the resurrected body undergo so wonderful and glorious a transformation in form as to be called "spiritual".

But the resurrection of Christ did not stand by itself as a mere isolated, marvellous event. In it the Crucified One triumphed over all the powers of evil, trampled death and Satan under His conquering foot, and, ascending to the right hand of the Father, took the kingdom and sovereignty of this world into His pierced hands. And, becoming the "first fruits of them that slept", He proclaimed victory over the most dreaded enemy, to all believers. "Thus", says Luther, "the resurrection is a chief article of faith. It and the Ascension are alone our comfort, life, victory and eternal happiness." No other truth of Christianity is so surcharged with assurance as to the all-important fact of immortality. The most blessed words that ever resounded over this tomb-marked world of ours and thrilled man's crushed spirit with rapture, are those of Christ: "I am the Resurrection and the Life."

The common Christian Faith, moreover, is one in the "*Holy Catholic Church*". Christ saw that the faith He revealed must have a visible organization to propagate it. So He established the Church, founded upon the Word and Sacraments. "Upon this Rock"—that of the truth of His divine Sonship—"I will build my Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it."

Baptism, the initial sacrament, was to be the door of entrance into this kingdom, the visible mark of the believer. The Lord's Supper was to be the oft-repeated feast of spiritual sustenance. At the Ascension the apostles were commissioned to preach the Word everywhere. The Church, thus holding forth the Word and Sacraments as the Means of Grace, was the divinely ordained instrumentality for Christianizing the world. Ad-

mitting exceptional instances, St. Augustine's rule therefore is correct: "He who has not the Church for his mother cannot have God for his father." "He that believeth *and is baptized* shall be saved", is the sovereign word of Christ. The Holy Spirit is given through the agencies of the Church for the birth of the new creature in Christ Jesus.

Christianity is, then, inseparably bound up with the Church. This was the position of the apostolic fathers. They held that the Church is Christ's mystical Body, and that they who wish to share His redemptive work must be members of that mystical Body. Hence the contention of some extreme liberals that the Church may yet pass and Christianity survive is an unscriptural and impossible one. Even Sabatier in his *Religions of Authority and the Spirit* admits that Religion cannot subsist without some visible form and acknowledged authority and head, and that it is alone by this Church that Christianity has subsisted these nineteen centuries. "The designation of the Church as Catholic", says Kurtz in his Church History, "dates from the time of Irenaeus, 130 A.D." "And the intent of this title was that it was", says Bishop Westcott, "to unite a variety of forms in one faith."

The Reformers rightly defined the Church thus in the Seventh Article of the Augsberg Confession: "One holy Church is to continue forever. The Church is the congregation of saints in which the gospel is rightly taught and the Sacraments administered according to the gospel. Nor is it necessary to the true unity of the Church that rites instituted by man should be alike everywhere. As St. Paul saith: 'There is one Faith, one Baptism, one God and Father of all.'"

The question of order is the most difficult confronting Christendom. By one party it is held that Scripture establishes the three orders of bishop, priest and deacon, that they have been historically perpetuated, and hence are necessary to the constitution of the church, and to a valid ministry. The other party hold that Scripture de-

fines the faith alone as essential, that *episcopos* and *presbuteros* are interchangeable terms, that there has been no unbroken historical succession of orders, and that, consequently, the form of government is not of the essence, but pertains to the liberty of the Church. Hence they hold faith and order not to be co-equal terms. But, the one is primary, the other secondary, the one is fundamental, the other administrative. Of these two positions it may be said, as Dean Stanley wittily remarked of the Lutheran doctrine of the Real Presence and the mere Memoriter view of some of the Reformers being both contained in the same ecclesiastical document, that it was well that they thus agreed amicably to *con*sist, as they would not be able to *sub*sist.

Passing by this question of order, we believe we have stated in briefest possible outline the essentials of the "common faith of Christendom in Jesus Christ our God and Saviour." Take away any of these foundation pillars, the Divinity, the Atonement, the Resurrection, or the Church, and no edifice of Christianity remains. Add to it and the structure becomes extra-Scriptural. This cannot be called the old any more than the modern view. The "Common Faith" must ever progress and adapt itself to new environments and newly discovered truths, but this progress, to be growth and not destruction, must be upon the old, unchanging eternal truth of God, as revealed in the Person and work of Jesus Christ. This faith may be called Scriptural, as declared by authority of Revelation; historical, as transmitted, unbroken, from age to age; confessional, as witnessed in the great Catholic or Ecumenical creeds; theological, or such as the great Christian thinkers have stated in scientific philosophical terms which have proven mighty bulwarks of Christianity; and experimental, as creating a new, higher, purer, and nobler spiritual life, unknown to the pre-Christian world.

This common faith, further, should produce Christian

unity. Christians were meant to constitute a brotherhood. Our Lord's great sacerdotal prayer was "That they all may be one." I cannot believe that this was meant to be merely a spiritual unity. Moreover, if there was a true spiritual unity we would not dwell apart. But it is precisely diversity of faith that causes these different denominations. Schisms in the faith are the cause of schisms in the church. It almost broke the mighty heart of Luther to strike the blow that severed the visible unity of the church in the Middle Ages. But it was an imperative necessity to save the true faith.

The deplorable schisms in the church come from two causes. Some insist on too little, while others demand too much. Rationalists would make the platform so broad that one holding the essential Christian faith could not conscientiously stand upon it, while conservative reactionaries would narrow it to traditions untaught in Scripture. By avoiding both these extremes alone can we come together. That we should constitute one great universal church there can be no doubt. Our Lord and Head must be deeply interested in this unity of those who call themselves after His name. So, let us have the faith to believe the prophecy of Père Hyacinthe: "In the sixteenth century the churches saved Christianity by separation. In the twentieth century Christianity will save the churches by bringing them together."

Toward this blessed end this call for a "World Conference" of the separated churches is looking, and therefore should it have the sympathy and prayers of Christians everywhere. If we are but faithful and yet charitable; if we "hold the truth in love"; then we can dwell in one fraternal Christian home, and then will this sad blot of schism be erased from our escutcheon; and then, when in every land and tongue there will be but one "Holy Catholic Church", "will", says Christ, "the world believe that thou hast sent me", and will the once thorn-crowned King reign over all the kingdoms of earth, as is His due.

Catholicity and Nationality

By Richard Roberts.

The European War has raised a large crop of very difficult and bewildering questions, and of these not the least urgent are those which relate to the place and function of the Church among the nations. Some effort appears to be called for to re-examine the entire subject. The present confusion has arisen largely from our neglect to adjust our conceptions of the Church and its office to the conditions of the modern world. Churchmen have overmuch permitted things to drift, without seriously endeavouring to discover whether the traditional syntheses to which they clung could stand the strain of the situation produced by modern political and economic developments. The European crisis took us unawares, and we were consequently caught in the general catastrophe. The Christian Church, in a sense, went to bits with the rest of the world; it seemed to have no word to utter save that of blessing and encouragement for the opposing combatants who went forth to war from the belligerent lands. Even the sentimental fiction of catholicity was shattered; and the opponents of Christianity were superficially justified in affirming that the most hopeless ruin in all this ruined world of Europe was the Church. Another tragical failure was laid to its account. Where then had things gone wrong? And how may this perplexing tangle be unravelled?

I

It would appear to be the first step in any examination of this situation that we should ask how it came to pass

that the national bond should prove so much stronger than the Christian bond. The Roman Catholic Church and the Salvation Army, the two really international Christian societies, have been cleft in twain. Other international institutions have, it is true, suffered in the same way. Some allowance must also be made for the fact that the Student Christian Movement, the Y.W.C.A. and possibly some other societies have succeeded to some extent in overcoming the tension created by a state of war. Nevertheless the broad fact remains that nationality has proved a stronger binding force than Christianity. What is still more disquieting is that the national principle has been able to evoke a devotion and a spirit of self-sacrifice that the Church has failed to win for the Kingdom of God.

These circumstances can, of course, be explained; but no explanation can mitigate the real failure that they expose. Romain Rolland has reminded us that the kingdom of Art transcends all national frontiers. Its life and commerce are carried through on a plane on which racial and political boundaries become impertinent and meaningless. It is a kingdom, universal, catholic, indivisible; and he who owns allegiance to it submits to an authority more sacred and exacting than that of mere nationalism. This is essentially the claim that in theory the Christian society makes. It is a very ancient Christian affirmation that in Christ the distinction between Jew and Greek, Barbarian and Scythian vanish; and it is this affirmation which is stultified by the events of today.

To trace this failure to its historical origins would be a long task. We should not be able to stop until we reached the conversion of Constantine and its ill-fated sequel, the formal association of Christianity with a still intensely pagan temporal power. The "Donation" of Constantine is probably mythical, but he must be regarded as the main fountain head of the movement which led at last to the mediaeval doctrines of the "two societies". The two societies, spiritual and temporal, consisted of the same

people but had separate heads, the one the Pope, the other the Emperor. The theoretical ground of this development was the Roman conception of the State with its doctrine of centralized authority, and this conception became the practical basis of the ecclesiastical order as well. This was an arrangement to which Dante looked back longingly in days when the Papacy had become a temporal power. Rome, he says,

> Was wont to boast two suns, whose several beams
> Cast light on either way, the World's and God's.
> One since hath quenched the other; and the sword
> Is grafted on the crook: and so conformed,
> Each must perforce decline to worse.

It is easy to see how, at the Reformation, the reaction from this position evoked the idea of the "national church". The paradox of the Reformation was this,—that while the mediaeval conception of the Church broke down, the Roman doctrine of the State still prevailed in Western Europe. The consequence was that the State everywhere assumed the supreme authority and determined the form and largely the doctrine of the Church within its bounds. In effect, the Church became ancillary to the State, and in return was protected by the power of the State. Nor has this national quality been restricted to the so-called "State Church". In England, the Free Churches are also essentially national societies, and curiously enough, have in general less sense of catholicity than the State Church. However it may be in theory, their working conception of the Church gives no appreciable room to any wider human bond than that of nationality. For the most part, they still regard missions as to a great extent a work of supererogation.

The Church unquestionably erred in giving too little respect to the idea of nationality. This was the result of conceiving the spiritual order in terms of Roman Imperialism. The result has been that nationality has turned and rent the Church. The present situation which makes nationality supreme is the inevitable recoil from one in

which nationality went for nothing. It requires no profound historical sense to recognize that nationality counts for a great deal in the world; and it is the business of the Church to discover a doctrine of nationality which will not be inconsistent with its own catholicity.

II

What then are the factors which create the sense of nationality?

(a) Comparatively little has been written upon the psychology of nationality, and what there is is not of first rate importance.[1] The principle plays a great part in history; but the historian is chiefly concerned with its external elements. Renan showed convincingly long ago in a short essay how little the conventional presuppositions concerning nationality have to do with it. It does not depend upon community of blood or speech, not on a common country or a common religion. This is not the place to recount his argument nor to add confirmatory data to it, though these have, on the side of anthropology, been much multiplied since his day. The natural history of the nation begins with the family. Then comes the tribe; and the nation grows through the expansion of the tribe (partly by natural increase, and partly by the voluntary or forced assimilation of other groups) up to a point determined by historical and political circumstances and geographical conditions. These aggregations which form nations may have come together in defence of some common interest, or as the result of conquest or dynastic unions. This, however, is but the beginning of things. The actual determination of national character is the product of the common life of these gathered peoples.

[1] An article in the *Sociological Review* (London), for October, 1915, by R. D. McIver is an exception. It is a searching scientific examination of the subject and affords for the first time a really stable basis for the discussion of the matter. The same may be said also of Dr. Chalmers Mitchell's little volume on *Evolution and the War*.

They live together under similar geographical and climatic conditions, and tend to produce a common physical type, —though this is a slow process and takes a very long time to obliterate original racial idiosyncrasies. But other processes are set afoot which are speedier in their results. The community develops a common outlook, common aspirations which give a distinctive colour to their art and music; they evolve a culture peculiarly their own. Moreover, they gradually find an increasingly powerful focus in an ordered State; and as the years go by, they build up a distinctive historical tradition gathering around the great figures and events of the past. There is no Englishman whose heart does not respond to the memory of Alfred the Great, Magna Charta, Drake and Trafalgar. Such as these are the factors in the formation of the national sense; and it will be observed as Dr. Chalmers Mitchell, the well known scientist, has recently pointed out that all the factors of nationality that really count are human products.[2]

(b) Moreover, it is clear that the principle of nationality has no fixity. A Welshman of twenty centuries ago would have counted himself one of the Silures or other of the four peoples who then inhabited the country. But a Welshman of 1700 would have deemed himself a member of the one Welsh nation which occupied the entire principality. The nationalism of Siluria had grown into the nationalism of Gwalia. But today the Welshman is conscious of himself as a Briton as well; and his nationalism, while its centre is still Wales, has grown to include the British Isles, and indeed all the Britains over the seas. The sentiment is the same throughout, but its object is continually expanding. What the Silure gave to his narrow little province, his descendant gives to the British Empire. And within this enormous political

[2] *Evolution and the War*, p. 91. "All the most important agencies producing the divergent modifications of the nations are human products and can be altered."

unity which is called (or rather miscalled) the British Empire, the same sentiment binds together men of different racial stocks and transcends their distinctions in a common loyalty. How true this is, certain recent events have shown.

This tendency is not confined to the British people. It may be seen elsewhere; and it is probably a circumstance of extreme value that people springing from different racial stocks should be gathered together into the same political unity. The doctrine which would make racial and political frontiers coincide is fallacious and mischievous. Lord Acton was right in upholding that the supreme test and security of liberty lay in peoples of different race living together in the one political community. Nor is there any peril of such a grouping of different races working out in a flat uniformity. For one thing, nature will look after her own function of variation; and for another, under conditions of freedom each racial group in the commonwealth is certain to realize its own peculiar genius without any loss of identity, and will contribute to the wealth of the whole. In any case, we observe that the historical tendency is to broaden the basis of national sentiment. We may perhaps conjecture that the nation represents a stage in the providential order by which a man is appointed to grow out of his individualism into a perfect catholicity of outlook and sympathy, from a clansman into a citizen of the world.

(c) We may add to these considerations the fact that national characters do not possess anything like an unchanging stability. They are modified by cross breeding, as we know; they are also subject to change as the result of national education and discipline. The diffusion of a particular set of ideas may cause far-reaching modifications in the temper and outlook of a people. Industrial and economic conditions very profoundly affect the spiritual and moral vigour of a nation. Nations may im-

prove and wax strong; new circumstances may arise and the tide turn. Progress may give place to decadence. The soul of a nation is not a static and rigid affair, it is probably the most sensitive thing in the world.

There is nothing then in the factors which produce the sentiment of nationality to justify a conception of it as a fixed and unchanging phenomenon, wholly untractable and unmalleable. The principle of nationality is admittedly a permanent element in the life of the world; but the actual content of the sense of nationality, its extent and its direction, is open to modification. It does not spring from the soil, and is not therefore to be regarded as being among the ultimate and unchangeable things. There is no such thing as a permanent, fixed national identity; the ingredients of the national consciousness are in a state of constant flux. Hence the hope and possibility of its redemption.

III

Nationalism has on the whole worked to the disadvantage of the world because it has misconceived itself. It has been said with truth that nationality is a good thing as long as it is an end to be struggled for; beyond that point it entails grave danger. Nationalism may become the mother of jingoism. This is connected with the fact that the struggle for nationality is essentially self-regarding. The self-regard persists when the goal has been reached and urges the nation to seek other goals. Self-interest becomes the dominant note, and it is as a matter of fact the regulative principle of the policies of all states. The first business of a nation (it is held) is to amass power and wealth, to make itself larger, stronger and richer than other nations. It will occupy itself therefore principally in safeguarding its material interests, defending its frontiers, increasing its prestige, and enlarging its territories whenever opportunity offers. Thus a nation only pursues its own interests at the expense of others. It comes to

regard its neighbours as commercial and political rivals and as eventually possible predatory enemies. This is the ultimate root of all international conflicts, the spring of all jealousies and enmities and the prolific source of wars. It sets up a series of wrong and debasing values, identifying national honour with national *amour propre*, exalting patriotism above humanity, and relegating other national names to a category of more or less contemptible inferiority.

But if the nations are thus governed by the principle of self-regard, how comes it to pass that this world is not a chronic cockpit? There are long periods of order and seeming tranquillity in history. The answer is, partly that the tranquillity is indeed only seeming, and partly that the conflict of interests is still active in commerce and diplomacy. The moral sense of the race has advanced so far as to impose certain checks and limitations upon the self-regarding activities of the nations, and these are embedded in international law, Hague conventions and the like. But the present war proves that it is impossible to moralize the present system of international relationships, and this is in the last analysis due to the fact that the current conception of nationality, because it is self-regarding, is consequently anti-social. Soon or late it breaks through the hedge of international agreements.

Is there then an alternative? Is this self-regarding bias in nationality inherent and ineradicable? We have already seen that the sentiment of nationality is not a brute unalterable fact. It is a ductile and malleable thing. May we not regard it as amenable to redemption, and its self-regard converted into an ideal of human service? It is surely not unreasonable to suppose that the Christian principle of personal conduct is applicable to the nation, and that the collective will of the nation may take a definitely Christian direction. This is virtually to suggest that a nation may deliberately and consciously come to conceive of itself as the trustee and

minister of humanity. It is and always will be the business of a nation to till its soil and to conduct its commerce so that there may be a sufficiency for all its people. As things are, the nations seek not a sufficiency but a superfluity, and this superfluity is ordinarily very unevenly distributed. But in this alternative doctrine it is implied that the riches of a nation are in its moral and intellectual rather than in its material resources, that its life consisteth not in the multitude of its possessions, but in its ethical and spiritual contribution to the life of the world. Adam Smith's doctrine has its spiritual as well as its economic applications. The history of the Jewish people is a parable for all peoples. Every nation is in a real sense "a chosen people", and it has some distinctive gifts to bring to the total wealth of life. And that great prophetic vision of the Jewish nation as "the suffering servant" is the high water mark of speculation upon this subject. It is in the exercise of such a ministry and such a trusteeship that a nation finds itself.

But is it not entirely fantastic to suppose that nations can ever be persuaded to act in this way? There are those who tell us that nations cannot from the nature of the case act unselfishly. That this is a perfectly gratuitous and unwarranted assumption needs no serious proof. There is no reason why, if any group of people can act from unselfish motives, a nation should not likewise be able so to act. The national *nexus* is not in its nature essentially different from the social *nexus* which binds any group of people together; and to deny that groups of people can act Christianly is to decline into the kind of pessimism which summarily hands the world over to the devil. It is true, as any observer of human phenomena knows, that a group of people may in certain circumstances act collectively on a plane morally lower than any individual in the group would by himself be likely to do. But this is only one half of an important truth. Groups may no less act collectively on a plane and reach a height

far higher than would be possible to the individual. The sense of solidarity may reinforce the timid and wavering motives of individuals and enable them to act together with a force and a consistency which would otherwise be beyond their power. The problem of christianizing a nation is not that of converting every individual in it. A. G. Hogg, in *Christ's Message of the Kingdom*, draws an important distinction between the people who are the salt of the earth and the people who are only salted, the former being the definitely and consciously Christian, the latter those whose minds have been more or less saturated with Christian ideas. We may count upon a point being reached in the process of christianizing a nation when it will be at least "salted", and it is not chimerical to suppose that its collective will may have a consistent Christian direction. It is indeed not impossible that the collective action of a Christian nation may be more consistent than the personal conduct of a Christian individual.

IV

What then should the Church say concerning nationality?

It will assuredly first of all refuse to recognize nationality as being inherently and necessarily a divisive principle,—else it must surrender its own hope of ultimate catholicity. It will steadily regard it as a principle of co-operation and decline to see in it the ineradicable source of international rivalry. There is nothing in the psychology of national feeling which justifies us in believing it to have an incurable bias to a narrow self-regard, and it will be the business of the Church to redeem it and to divert it into the channel of goodwill and mutual service, declaring the while that this alone can enable the nations to achieve the best and fullest self-realization. Patriotism will be still accounted a great and noble virtue, but it will be the patriotism of Isaiah and not the patriotism of the chauvinist.

But the Church will none the less affirm that nationality does not rank as an ultimate principle for the determination of conduct. To do so is to exalt what is partial and sectional above the universal. We have seen that historically nationality is in its actual content perpetually shifting and changing; and it is not to be classed among the primary principles of moral conduct—which never change. Its sanctions are no doubt high, but they are not supreme. The nationalism which sides with "*my country right or wrong*" is a stark atheism. On this view a nation has no end higher than itself. Its own self-preservation and self-aggrandizement become its *suprema lex*. This is plainly the road to anarchy, the denial of all absolute and supra-national moral sanctions. And even if it does not entail a denial of God, it certainly degrades God to the level of a tribal deity and brings us back to a crude and rudimentary state of human development.

It is indeed not necessary that the Church should belittle nationality in order to set it in its own secondary place. That will follow if only the Church will recover the New Testament emphasis and give it its true position in its witness. And that is, that for the regulation of all human conduct whether individual or collective two points shall be always sovereign,—reverence for personality, and responsibility to God. Reverence for personality means that we respect in every man that which makes him a man,—not that which makes him a Briton, a German or an American. The moral of the parable of the good Samaritan is that good neighbourhood,—essential humanity—is independent of community of race or of religion. It belongs to a region far deeper than those associations which bind us into classes and nations, to that one blood of which God has made all nations of men. Reverence for personality is the root of brotherhood.

But the New Testament carries still farther. It not only exalts personality; but it reminds us of a unity of need and a community of redemption which binds man-

kind into one with a triple bond. It contemplates a human unity in Jesus Christ which reaches below distinctions of race, of station, even of sex,—where Jew and Greek, bond and free are "one man". This does not mean that the Jew ceases to be a Jew or the Greek a Greek, but that in their community of origin, of need and of redemption, they discover that they are brothers. Let but the Church insist on this, and problems of nationality will take their natural place.

Not that they will be forgotten. On the contrary they will be studied in their true setting. We shall understand once more that God sets men down in nations, "determining the bounds of their habitations", for His own purpose, which is "that they should seek God". The nation is one of the divine ordinances by which God designs men to find Him; and it is as they find Him that they find themselves. But they find Him where He is ever to be found,—in the paths of service, of goodwill, of faith. It is the office and the glory of the Church to lead the nations into these paths; and these are also the paths of peace.

It has been said that the nineteenth century was the century of nationality. Despite the present conflagration, the twentieth century may yet well become the century of internationalism. The method of war is proving itself bankrupt and breaking down beneath its own weight. That is the judgment of many today who are competent to judge. By sheer force of circumstances, the nations will yearn to discover "the more excellent way". Of that way, the Church is the divinely appointed trustee. That its failure to teach it to the nations should have provoked this world catastrophe is a circumstance in which it should find a call and a challenge to begin to teach it afresh with more resolution and power than before. In teaching the nations to find their true life, it will discover its own; and in the brotherhood of nations, realize its own catholicity.

Christianity, a Unifying Power in War-Time

By Ernest Rochat, D.D.,
Professor at the University of Geneva, Switzerland.

Humanity is today thrown into confusion. The European War is, for us all, a veritable calamity. These tragical events, which we follow with such keen interest and such breathless anxiety, have had a terrible repercussion in the spiritual domain.

We may have discussed the War and foreseen its horrors, we may have calculated the chances of victory or defeat, but who could have predicted the havoc it would work amongst ideas which seemed firmly settled and capable of resisting the most violent shocks.

The religious question has once more become an open question, and that in the most serious sense. That the value and legitimacy of Christianity itself are called in question today, cannot be doubted. In the raging tempest that has broken over Europe, one country, surrounded by the belligerents, has had the immense privilege, up to the present, of living in unmolested peace. Switzerland however, far from being indifferent to what is going on around her, has chosen to play an international part which has elicited approval, and which cannot fail to strike thoughtful and observing minds.

This fact is worthy of note. Is it possible to find any point of contact between the two orders of fact here referred to? Is it possible by showing the work Switzerland has accomplished since the outbreak of hostilities, to derive from such considerations anything favourable to

Christianity, anything which can successfully plead its cause, with those who at present are only disposed to criticize and reprove, in a word, anything that is in itself a proof of the efficacy of Christianity as a means of union between nations even though they be divided? Such is our question.

I

The emotion caused by the declaration of war and by the first deeds that followed the outbreak of hostilities has increased because the name of God has been invoked in these painful circumstances. His protection has been claimed, His help expected to secure victory and destroy the enemy. Such expectations have found voice in all the nations whose armies are in the battle-field. France alone, for reasons which we can easily divine, seems to have left out this question entirely. Thus, we are able to say that the fact was almost general. The invocation to God at such a time was the sting that irritated and called attention to the religious problem.

Was this invocation to God offensive in itself? It might be to materialists, atheists, or free thinkers, if we take the word in its usual meaning; they might see in it a blow struck at freedom of thought, or they might consider it as simply ridiculous. On the other hand, a religious soul, a pious man might find such an invocation quite natural. Nothing, indeed, is more justifiable. This call for help from above, this confidence in the Almighty's protection, would not seem out of place to him. We are sure that to many people it did not. But protestations arose immediately from all quarters; they came sometimes from those who objected to religion, and sometimes they were made in the name of religion itself! What then pained religious minds, and even a great number of those who, although they profess to be of anti-religious opinions, have preserved, perhaps without being aware of it, a vague feeling of piety? What was the reason of these

protestations? We were once more brought face to face with the antique divinity, the national divinity who stood by the people He had chosen and would protect. It was a revival of the conception of the Jahveh of Israel, leading His people to the fight, upholding them all in battle and delighted with their victory and we may add with the overthrow of their enemies. This religious conception reappearing in the twentieth century of Christianity seemed, as it well might, an anachronism, and the modern conscience rebelled against it, at least amongst those who were not directly concerned in the war.

It is not only the idea of God which has been discussed, but also that of the justice of God. Some very religious and believing souls were in that respect deeply agitated and distressed. In face of the horrors related day after day, they came to doubt the justice of God, they desired His direct intervention, and of course, in favour of those for whom they wished the victory. On somewhat different grounds we find in fact the same way of thinking, the same antique notion of divinity. They say that God should take part for one side against the other, or that He should respond to private demands, and fulfil the wishes of the individual or of different groups,—in a word, that He should exert His almighty power according to the will of mankind. Man believes himself to be so wise that he mistakes his wishes for the expression of justice, and expects that God will satisfy them. Man thinks that he may command and that God must obey. If He does not obey, then He is either unjust or even does not exist.

How very different seems to us the justice of God if we consider it as the progressive and final realization of laws adapted to humanity, laws which govern its existence and development, and which it cannot violate with impunity. How and when do these laws issue in effect? We do not see this immediately, we do not *always* see it and perhaps we shall *never* see it. Human life is too short. Man

desires happiness during his stay on this earth. Suffering baffles him, he revolts against it. He makes God responsible for it and rebels against Him.

Thus in this perplexity of thought and conscience we hear many voices proclaim the failure of religion and of Christianity. Others proclaim at the same time the failure of justice and morality. The tempest which has burst over Europe has swept away the secret foundations on which its life was built. To us there is exaggeration, indeed error, in these affirmations. Religion, morality and right will last as long as humanity itself, because they are the foundations of its existence, it cannot live without them. But what *does* perplex and disconcert us is the helplessness of the Christian Churches. The Protestant Churches made no attempt to prevent the Declaration of War. It may be urged that the secret of their helplessness lay in the fact that they are only held together by spiritual bonds, that they are not grouped round a central authority. This argument, however, is valueless, for the Roman Catholic Church, which possesses such an authority and has members in all the militant countries, was also paralysed. Papacy was mute. It said nothing, probably it could not speak, and even if it could have done so, unfortunately none would have lent an ear.

What fills us with still greater astonishment, with fear and trembling, is that the Peace Societies that have been so active in the last few years and have witnessed an extension of their influence should, at the critical moment, have been reduced to silence. Then too international socialism on which pacifists believed they could rely, and which did not fear to protest many a time against war and the increase of armaments, has by its attitude misled those who founded legitimate hopes upon it. And Free Masonry, whose pacific tendencies were well known, and which by its international ramifications and influence appeared capable of preventing the conflict, remained also tongue-tied.

Have all these failed? Is nothing to remain of these groupings and institutions? Is our modern society to hide them away as antiquities in historical museums without attributing to them any present or future value? That is not our opinion. We are however obliged to confess with deep sadness the eclipse of all that represented an ideal among us, and of all spiritual power. This for the moment has been reduced to a mere semblance. Material force, brutal force prevails. It alone is esteemed and sought after. The rest counts for little or nothing.

II

And yet, just when this hot breath of violence is sweeping over Europe, withering the Spirit, just when doubt is seeming to undermine our most cherished beliefs, just when sadness is darkening our hearts and the future looms heavy with threats and uncertainty before us, Switzerland has drawn all eyes on her by the attitude she has wisely taken up. Certainly she is not free from anxiety, and difficulties are not spared her. She has been obliged from the first moment to call out her troops. Her workshops are almost empty, her fields without labourers, her trade stopped. Not being able to supply herself with all necessaries she is at the mercy of the good will of other nations for provisions. From a political point of view her position is quite as perplexing. As a neutral country determined to maintain her neutrality Switzerland has had extremely difficult juridical questions to settle. She is obliged to consider the interests of each, to offend none, and at the same time to find the means of sustaining her trade and maintaining her commerce. Financially and above all because of the mobilization of her army, expenses have increased and funds diminished. It is true that she has not actually suffered from the horrors of the war, but she has felt its terrible repercussion. However, while striving to guard her national hearth as far as possible,

she has felt it impossible to remain indifferent to what is taking place all around her. Not being overwhelmed herself she is holding out a helping hand to others. Thus she has understood the international part she is called to play and has devoted herself to it with an enthusiasm and abnegation that have been appreciated. Events are constantly bringing new needs into existence, which she is endeavouring to meet. Committees have been constituted, associations organized, "good works" multiplied. It may not be without interest to refer in detail to this effort that may well be called enormous if we consider the smallness in area and wealth of the country that has made it. The action of Switzerland may be considered from two points of view: the *practical* and the *spiritual.*

The movements of a *practical* order are very numerous. Honour where honour is due. First and foremost the *Red Cross.* The work of the Committee of the Red Cross is well known, through reports periodically published and numerous newspaper articles. A brief sketch of its principal services will suffice: requests for enquiries for the wounded and non-wounded; search for soldiers and civilians: correspondence with prisoners of war; exchange of the "seriously wounded" and "seriously ill"; assistance for needy prisoners; sending of parcels to the war departments in Paris or Berlin and of objects to be forwarded that have been found on the dead; enquiries about the delivery of correspondence in concentration camps; sending of money and parcels to prisoners, etc. This has only to do with the west front. If we reflect a little, we can imagine the great amount of work done by the 1,200 fellow workers of the Red Cross, especially when we learn that from October 15, 1914, to November 30, 1915, the Agency gave 331,242 indications to enquirers, and received 73,000 persons, that during the first three months of the war no fewer than 25,000 letters were received a day (the number now being fewer) and that it has about a million check tickets.

Of all the sufferings that were inflicted on the families of the soldiers, one of the keenest was the ignorance in which they were left about their relations no one knowing what had become of many of them, they were considered as lost! Such cases awakened deep pity. Switzerland was well placed to try and obtain information about these soldiers, all traces of whom were lost. So well was this appreciated that requests came, in abundance, from afflicted families. Switzerland, as we can well understand, made every possible effort to assuage their sufferings, communicating with everybody whose position rendered it possible to get information. Moreover, private movements were started which gradually developed into offices, and organizations were created exclusively for the purpose of "Searching for the Lost".

Free Masonry here played a useful part. In the month of August the International Masonic Office, managed by M. Quartier, la Tente, Neuchâtel, received numerous letters requesting that search be made for children placed in Germany or France, of whom there was no news, and for prisoners or adults settled in both countries. The Free Masons of Germany and France were most obliging in facilitating these enquiries, and thus Switzerland was able to console many an anxious family and to become the means of sending back to their respective countries—not without difficulty—many girls and boys and to give news of prisoners and of the wounded. This work developed rapidly by the force of circumstances. To the enquiries coming from France or Germany were added little by little those from Austria and Hungary. In November, 1915, this office, which depended in reality on one or two persons, attended to more than 600 prisoners in different countries, was the intermediate agent between them and their families, and took the responsibility of sending them money, food and clothing. The work as we see had developed and had turned somewhat aside from its original purpose. Free Masons desired to return

to it. The Grand Swiss Alpina took on its own account this service, created by one of its members and without plans for the future. It organized in Lausanne and Geneva in the course of last summer an office which was devoted *exclusively* to the search for those who had disappeared. It obtained some result.

There exists a similar work at Zurich. "The Office for the search for the Lost" founded in March, 1915, attended at first solely to French, English and Belgian, or German soldiers. Satisfactory results crowned its efforts, but it is easy to understand the difficulties of such a task if we remember that the cases laid before the Committee as before others of the same kind concern almost exclusively people whose names are not on the official lists of prisoners. Many soldiers have disappeared without leaving any trace, interred with no mark of identification on them, buried under rubbish, drowned in marshes. It is fortunate if a comrade can be discovered by chance who can give some exact information as a witness of the last moments of the lost man. The families receive this information with gratitude; they then know at least something about him for whom they weep. Since last August, at the request of the International Committee of the Red Cross of Geneva, this office at Zurich obtained also information about civilians in Austria and Italy. We see how the field of activity of these movements is developing with events. Their service has rapidly extended and produced results all the more fortunate as it concerns almost always persons who are living and whose residence is sought for.

Under the same order of Good Works we must mention the "Service for reintegrating civil prisoners in their own country". It is due to the initiative of M. Edouard Audeoud of Geneva. Struck by the lamentable position of civilians detained by one or other of the belligerent countries, he sought for some practical means of obtaining their liberty and developed the project of sending back to their own country through Switzerland the natives of

Germany, Austria-Hungary, and of France. For this it was necessary to obtain the consent of the three belligerent nations. During the second fortnight of August, M. Audeoud exposed his plan to M. Hoffmann, Federal Counsellor, then President of the Swiss Confederation. The latter heartily welcomed the plan and had it approved of by the Federal Council. The belligerent nations advised of the matter agreed to it. The Swiss political department then created a department for the reintegration of civil prisoners, with the head office at Berne and two auxiliary offices or halting places, at Geneva near the French frontier and at Schaffhouse near the German frontier. The Auxiliaries were entrusted with the mission of receiving the convoys of civil prisoners on their arrival from France or Germany and of sending them on to either of the two countries. Those who belong to one of the belligerent countries and are staying on the territory of another are considered as civil prisoners. On their arrival in Switzerland these prisoners were identified. They received food, medical care and clothing when necessary. Then the convoys left again for the opposite frontier accompanied by the Swiss delegates. The service was carried on until March, 1915, but most intensely during the months of November and December, 1914.—188 convoys carried 20,475 persons—women, children, young men under 17 years and men over 60 years of age. The division was as follows: 10,845 French, 7,650 Germans, 1,980 Austrians. This service, so highly appreciated, was transformed in March, 1915. It passed without change, so to speak, under the Swiss Military Authorities and was utilized for the "*repatriated*", that is to say, especially for the French living in the "*departments*" invaded by the German army, and who were obliged to leave their dwellings. They were thus enabled to enter the interior of France. The French State then provided them with a dwelling and support if necessary. From the month of March, 1914, to the end of September, 1915, 198

convoys carried 67,159 persons: 65,539 French, 1,136 Germans, 484 Austro-Hungarians. In all 87,634 civil prisoners reintegrated (to the end of October, 1915, 88,376) have since the beginning of the war crossed through Switzerland. It is difficult to imagine in what a state of privation, of physical and moral misery all these unfortunate people were, and especially those who, arrested at the beginning of the war, had been placed in concentration camps, and had remained there for weeks, often exposed to the worst evils of such conditions. It was misery in all its bitterness and in every shape and form. Devoted people—and they were many—who lent their assistance, have seen many a tear shed, but they have had the satisfaction of having given gentle consolation and having brought a ray of sunshine into the hearts of multitudes of despairing souls. This service has been entirely gratis. No one, neither the commissaries nor their helpers, has received any payment. All that was distributed in food and clothing was voluntarily given by the Swiss people. No collection was made for these great needs. Every one, even children, took a pride in contributing according to their means. In the distribution of these offerings, naturally no difference was made between French, Germans or Austrians. Pity for these unfortunate ones engendered an admirable outburst of charity and sympathy.

The universities also were moved by the intellectual consequences of the war. Seeing how many professors fell on the field of battle, they thought that in trying to bring some help to those who were made prisoners they would also be working for the cause of civilization. Feeling this, they opened the "Swiss University Work for Imprisoned Students". To try to preserve these young men from physical misery, to send them the intellectual and moral comfort they require, to provide them with necessary books and reviews, and supply those who have no money with pecuniary aid—such are the aims the

Swiss Universities and the Federal Polytechnicum have set before them. This desire to save intellectual and scientific life and to maintain it in the future is most praiseworthy. This work has met with a great deal of sympathy and has found a pretty wide field of action. The Geneva Committee alone, for instance, looks after about 350 prisoners, French, Belgian, and Russian, professors, teachers and students. This number will no doubt increase. One can easily imagine what expansion this work is destined to take.

If we add to all this the free correspondence service between civilians living in any of the belligerent countries, the exchange of convalescent soldiers, the individual work for obtaining information, and notably that of clergymen who have always met with the most touching kindness from their French or German colleagues—we shall have an idea of what Switzerland has done in a practical way, and certainly we have not exhausted the list of all that has been set on foot in this country of the Red Cross to help those who are suffering from the War.

This is, of course, Switzerland's most tangible service to Humanity, in the present crisis. Spiritual action is, for the moment, less effectual, and this can be readily understood. It exists, however, and has the future more directly in view.

The reformed churches of Switzerland have had their place to take in this domain and their part to play. This they have understood. They realized, in the ecclesiastical centres, that they had to work to help the different peoples to know each other better and to cease hating each other. They consider that Christian principles should be the rule of life for States as well as for individuals, that justice and fraternity should inspire international relationship for the future, that international conflicts should be settled by measures of justice and conciliation. Only on these terms can the desired peace be real and lasting. The ministers of the gospel have thus

their task traced out. It is in this direction that they are endeavouring to guide public opinion. To pursue this aim is to serve the kingdom of God. It is the duty of the churches of neutral countries especially, to remind the belligerents that Christians have a common Fatherland, the Kingdom of God. It will be a long work, but it must be undertaken. In this spirit, in March, 1915, a "Swiss section of the Universal Alliance of the Churches for the development of friendly relations between peoples" was founded. It was affiliated to the Alliance which, since the end of 1914, has united churches of the United States, of England, Denmark, Holland and Norway in one common effort. The Swiss Protestants, in the meetings of this new society, have expressed the wish to see the Roman Catholics and the members of other churches unite their efforts with theirs. The future will show us what is reserved for these praiseworthy and fraternal intentions.

A similar ideal but more specially inspired by ideas of a national, juridical and moral order determines the formation of the "Association for the study of the bases for a lasting peace". Switzerland, already, is, in the opinion of the best thinking men, the right country to undertake the task of persuading the different nations to study questions now urgent, and to allow the preparation of a treaty of peace, which shall prevent the repetition of such a catastrophe as that which afflicts the whole world today. This Association, which is in correspondence with the Dutch Anti-War League, had arranged an international congress, which should have met in Bern in December, 1915. Complications, however, have arisen that have caused the congress to be postponed. But the requests to join received from Europe and America convince us that there is real need of it, probably because it is just, and is intended to serve the higher interests of humanity.

We do not intend to give here the list of all the societies and groups that are formed to try and remedy in a spirit-

ual way the evils of the war. The above examples suffice to show devotion to an ideal and the fact that a neutral country has a task to accomplish in these hard times.

III

"Let . . . men see your good works, that they may glorify your father which is in Heaven." These words of Jesus come to our memory when we think of what Switzerland has done. Far be it from us to boast or be proud of the fact that Switzerland, sheltered from the calamities of war wished, so to speak, to pay her debt to humanity, and to attenuate the misfortunes of others, as far as in her lay. She has done so with earnestness and conviction. She has united, in a unanimous effort, Christians, Protestants, Catholics, Jews and Free Thinkers. And we cannot help seeing in the spirit and unanimity of it the manifestation of Christian sentiments, openly confessed by some, repudiated by others, but *certain* nevertheless and *evident* in all. Mercy, pity, kindness, devotion, and sacrifice, the manifestation of these is what we have seen day after day. Today the desire for justice, the attention to moral law, the necessity for a wider and more active fraternity, have openly imposed themselves on our consciences. And is not this just what the Gospel demands? Doubtless Christianity has, in spite of all, penetrated our souls and directed them towards a better life. These works are the proof. Moreover, they are evidence of the value of Christianity as a universal religion and the source of union between peoples. In them Christianity finds its most complete expression. Christianity latent in the soul has produced them, and the contact with the actual life of today is obliging souls to seize great truths proclaimed by the religion of Jesus which bring to light His *universalism* and is raising those souls to the realization of the Fatherland of God. Humanity is today undergoing severe self-examination and this may eventually help to serve the cause of religious progress. We

may hope that a more effectual tolerance will reign among men. Fanaticism unfortunately will always have its adepts. But those who have fought and suffered together will have learned to know and appreciate each other better. We too shall value more the secret motives, the hidden sentiments and the religious faith that have inspired us to actions that bring benefit to others. Many barriers will fall and many prejudices be dissipated; kindness will rule human intercourse. Each one will keep his own faith while respecting that of others. Actions to the honour of humanity have been performed on the battle-field:—they are a noble lesson. They have brought nearer together in mutual understanding those who did not know each other yesterday. In a word they have awakened love.

With love they have thrown a new light on the great principle of human fraternity, proclaimed so loudly by the Nazarene. This fraternity has united citizens of the same country who were separated and divided before the war. We have just said that it has been shown even between enemies. Doubtless such cases are not so rare as we suppose. It may well be that those who have been in the trenches, who have seen death so near, who have appreciated the courage of their adversaries and looked on actions of heroism, may tomorrow be led to celebrate human valour, and perhaps to call those men brothers, who but yesterday were their enemies. Those who do so will have understood Christian fraternity in all its beauty, and it would not be surprising (if they are encouraged and helped ever so little) to see them become its preachers.

Let us take a last step. Human fraternity if supplied with new strength will bring about new modifications in the idea of God. We shall return to the conception of the God of Jesus, the All-Father, whom He *understood* in the ardour of His faith, *contemplated* in the limpidity of His conscience and *adored* with all the power of His heart. That God will be no more the God of battles and

of death. He will be, that which He is, the God of holiness, justice, mercy, and love. When Christians cling to Him firmly and adore Him as Jesus did, then Christendom will enter on a new way where it will no longer suffer and mourn as at the present hour. That Christianity which is the Gospel will truly be the *power of union* and of the life that the human heart desires and of which we already see new manifestations.

Archbishop Theodore:
English Church Reunion in the Seventh Century

By Benjamin W. Wells, Ph.D.

In 660 the English Church was hardly less divided than the English nation. In 690 a united Church, organized on lines that were to outlast political conquests, beckoned the English people to a unity of which the Church had set the example and to which it had shown the way. How did it happen? There ought to be something in this old story suggestive at least of the spirit in which we may most hopefully approach the greater problem of Church unity in our day, and it may perhaps not seem wholly insignificant that this great gift to the people of England was secured with the help of a Roman, with the co-operation of an African, and, in largest measure, through the guiding statesmanship of a Greek. The whole story of the transformation is in the life of Archbishop Theodore.

History does not repeat itself. Its parallels are never perfect. But in the Churches of the English kingdoms in the seventh century we may see forces triumphing which are very like those that today are drawing Christians of many names and nations toward fuller fellowship and union. The success then won is a good augury of what, in times so visibly pregnant with change as ours, may be gained today or in the long tomorrow.

The record of these decades of transformation in the English Church is exceptionally full. Bede was almost a contemporary. He was a scholar, a critic, an earnest

seeker after truth. But he was a man of peace and passed lightly over controversies which as they are related by others, less scrupulous, distort the facts in ways that have served the purpose of later controversialists also. The task of the student of today is to put the facts in their true perspective, to weigh the reluctant against the over-eager testimony. The dramatic narrative of an ardent and not over-cautious admirer has made Wilfrid of York seem to many the central figure in events in which his part was in fact quite subordinate. The controversial interests of a later day, finding an eloquent advocate in Montalembert, have given a very exaggerated and distorting importance to the epoch-marking, rather than epoch-making Synod of Whitby. It is not to the present purpose to retell the story of that gathering, but it is necessary to state in a few words what that synod showed and what it did not show, what it effected and what it did not effect, in order to understand the situation that faced Archbishop Theodore when, five years later, he came to England.[1]

The Church founded in Kent by Augustine, had, after some ill-starred missionary efforts, become quiescent under English archbishops, with considerable interruptions in the succession. Its ecclesiastical power or influence hardly extended beyond the limits of that little kingdom. In East Anglia clergy from Gaul had founded a mission, which soon came under English control and might claim to be the first independent English Church. Its bishop had gone to Canterbury for consecration, for that was most convenient, but they had no more than a friendly interest in the ecclesiastical affairs of Kent, and, through the course of political events, they presently

[1] A collation and critical examination of the sources of information regarding Whitby and Wilfrid was made by the present writer in The English Historical Review, Vol. 6, p. 535, ff. The results have not, to my knowledge, been controverted. So far as they are germane to the present purpose they are embodied, without further discussion in what follows.

found their natural place in the church polity of Northumbria. In Wessex an Italian bishop, on a mission quite independent of Canterbury, had been followed by a Gaul trained in Ireland and he by a Saxon ordained in Gaul, thus affording three-sided evidence of international fraternity and also of defective ecclesiastical order. Sussex had as yet no organized Church. In Essex and, a little later, in Mercia English missionaries, who had been trained under Scottish auspices in Northumbria, had built up relatively strong missions. Northumbria, after a mission from Canterbury had been wrecked by revolution, had been the scene of some wonderful missionary work by bishops and monks from Iona, a monastic settlement founded by Scots from Ireland three generations before. When Colman was sent from Iona to succeed Finan (661) he was the only bishop of foreign birth in England.

In the South the Churches had become native in government because the clergy from the continent had not been replaced as death claimed them and because the Scots, so far as their influence extended, fostered native control. A similar movement could not long be deferred in Northumbria, where at that time both political and religious life were most vigorous. The Scots had, indeed, done nothing to arouse jealousy. They had been before-hand in helpfulness; always ready for what we should now call federation, though not as yet for unity. It was only natural, however, that the most powerful of English kingdoms should chafe under ecclesiastical dependence such as was implied in receiving their bishops from Iona. But that there was no conscious antagonism between the churches of continental and of Scottish origin is plainly implied again and again in the course of Bede's story.[2] Intermarriages had been frequent for

[2] Consider for instance what is implied in King Oswald's treatment of James the Deacon, Bede, II, 20; in the cordial relations of Aidan, Honorius and Felix, Bede III, 25; in the story of Abbess Hilda, pupil

thirty years before the Synod of Whitby. The differences were of practice rather than of principle, and perhaps of spirit more than of either. Those who owed their conversion to the Scots may well have had a fond regard for the customs of their teachers, but they must have felt that only in fellowship with the continental churches could they hope to share in the spiritual life of the western world and the rich experience of the Roman Church, an inestimable aid, almost a necessity for an enduring Christian life in those newly converted and relatively remote regions.

Oswy, the King of Northumbria, was a statesman with a vision. He saw the possibilities of union and he saw the opportunity afforded by the presence of some zealous and talented foreigners and advocates of continental ways. He summoned a synod and by including the foreigners in the call made his own wishes clear. He secured naturally, in the main, an amicable agreement. But except to change the calendar and the customary tonsure the Synod of Whitby had little immediate effect on Northumbria, none at all on the rest of England. Its political and ecclesiastical importance was indirect and not yet apparent. Indeed the months that followed were peculiarly dark for the Southern Churches. A plague carried off half the bishops and a large part of the clergy. In Mercia and Northumbria alone were there signs of vigorous Church life.

Once more the King saw and grasped the possibilities of a difficult situation. He was recognized chief of English kings. He resolved to get a similar head for

---

of the Roman Paulinus and the Gaul Felix, who came to the Scots without a scruple, Bede III, 23; in Queen Enfled's intercession for Wulfhere, Bede III, 24; in the baptism by Cedd of King Swidhelm, with King Ethelwald as sponsor, in a kingdom then under the church leadership of Felix, a Gaul, Bede, III, 22; in the relations of this same Gallic Bishop Felix with the Scottish Fursey, Bede III, 19, 25; in the passing of Wessex from the Italian Birinus to the Gallo-Scottish Agilbert and from him to the Anglo-Gallic Wini, Bede III, 7. The list could easily be extended.

the English Churches and so to prepare the minds of Englishmen for a united kingdom. But jealousies between the kingdoms would make the acceptance of any English primate difficult, unless he came to them with a sanction that all alike respected from the recognized chief dignitary of the Western Church. Oswy felt that Rome, following the precedent of Gregory, would naturally be disposed to favour some cleric from Kent. So, after counsel with the Kentish king and "the election and consent of the Church," Wighard was sent to Rome for ordination. Oswy moved cautiously, for his declared purpose, according to Bede, was not that the new archbishop might form an English Church but that "he might ordain Catholic heads for the English Churches". But that the king had already the larger policy in view what followed amply attests.

Events favoured him singularly. Wighard and all his English companions died in a pestilence at Rome. Pope Vitalian in sending news of this to Oswy assumes that, in such a contingency, the choice was to be left to him. And indeed, even had that been an unjustified assumption, Oswy had every reason to be content with the turn of affairs. It had been expedient to send a Kentishman; his policy would be better served by a foreigner with no private grudges and no local prejudices.

Vitalian "sought diligently" but it was hard to find a man who was both fit and willing to go. He was disposed to send Adrian, an African by birth and abbot of a monastery near Naples. Adrian suggested a certain Andrew and, as second choice, Theodore, a learned monk of Tarsus, sixty-six years old and not as yet in orders. Few selections could have seemed less auspicious, none could have been more fortunate. Theodore consented to go if Adrian, who had already been twice in Gaul, would go with him. To this the pope agreed with alacrity and determined that Adrian should remain Theodore's constant companion, "to see that he introduced nothing

contrary to the faith in the Greek way". These fears of Monothelite leanings were groundless; but Theodore's tonsure, the Pauline, while without offence at Rome, might perhaps perplex in England, where controversy over a similar usage had just been happily allayed. It took some months for the old man's hair to grow sufficiently to emphasize the Roman tonsure. Wighard had left England in the summer of 667. It was May of 668 before Theodore left Rome and not till twelve months later, after various detentions, that he at last reached Canterbury, where Adrian rejoined him later in the year.

Theodore's first concern in England, like that of the Puritans in Massachusetts, was for an educated ministry. St. Augustine's, the monastery at Canterbury which had been for some time without an abbot, was placed temporarily under the care of the scholarly and enthusiastic Northumbrian Biscop, who had been first of Englishmen to make pilgrimage to Rome and was later to found the great Northumbrian School at Yarrow, the nursery and home of Bede. Biscop presently transferred the abbacy to Adrian who was also a scholar of distinction. Then, at length, Theodore, gathering up the strength and the experience of his sixty-eight years, felt ready to enter on the great task to which Oswy had called him, the union of the English Churches.

The prospect in the various fields of Theodore's coming labours had much to encourage but much also that might well daunt a man of nearly seventy. In East Anglia Bishop Boniface was either dying or already dead; in Essex the erratic Wini offered no sure support; Wessex had been three years without a bishop; in Mercia both Church and State were aggressively jealous of their independence. Northumbria indeed would show him a healthy church life, but against Bishop Chad and his clergy, Theodore had been predisposed by what he had heard from friends of Wilfrid at Paris when he was on his way to England and later at Canterbury, and he looked

on them with a suspicion that direct observation alone could dispel. On the other hand Churches that were weak might be more readily disposed to submission, that they might gain strength from union, and he could look to Oswy for practical sanction even to autocratic measures. It lay neither in the mind of Oswy nor of Theodore to preserve the plan of Gregory and to accord equality to the See of York. Theodore recognized no co-ordinate authority and found no bishop disposed to assert it. "He was the first archbishop", says Bede, "to whom every Church consented to give the hand."

Secure in the support of Oswy, apparently with the sympathy of the best elements in all the Churches, none of whose clergy or monks could feel the same jealousy of a Greek that they might of any Anglian or Saxon, Theodore proceeded to assert his authority in person, with firmness yet with tact, in the various English kingdoms.

First the new Archbishop went to East Anglia where, since he could not find a man quite suited to his purpose, he selected Bisi, a holy man of frail health, whose not untimely death four years later renewed the opportunity to carry out under more favourable conditions the policy on which Theodore had already determined. For Rochester he found in Putta a good subordinate. Then, leaving Wini for the moment undisturbed in Essex, he turned to Northumbria where he found Oswy's desire for church unity so great that the King was willing to support the Archbishop's autocratic intervention even against his own royal judgment. Theodore was suffered to depose Chad, a most saintly man, whom the King had raised to power, and to give his see to Wilfrid, who had been consecrated in Gaul, some years before, it would seem as bishop for a province then governed by Oswy's son Aldfrid, though Wilfrid is said to have alleged that he had grounds to claim that the consecration was for York and that Oswy had changed his mind during Wilfrid's absence in Gaul. The new Archbishop saw that Wilfrid

was the most talented English churchman of his generation. He could not foresee that he would prove the most ambitious and restlessly aggressive of them.

Theodore had got the impression, apparently from Wilfrid or his friends, that Chad had not been canonically consecrated. Chad had, on his appointment, gone to Canterbury for consecration but, finding no bishop in Kent at that time, he had turned to Wessex, where Wini, whose own orders were Gallican, consecrated him with the aid of two British bishops. What followed Theodore's intervention is variously told. According to Bede and intrinsic probability Chad said to Theodore that he would gladly yield an office of which he had never thought himself worthy. Theodore "hearing the humility of his response, said he ought not to lose his episcopate and afterward consummated his ordination in the Catholic way". For a time Chad lived in retirement. But when the Mercian King asked Theodore to send a bishop "for him and his", Theodore "did not wish to ordain a new bishop and asked Oswy's permission to give them Chad". Theodore never hesitated at any period of his archiepiscopate to remove any bishop. He could have known nothing of the personal character of either man when first he came to Northumbria. Wilfrid had the prestige of Roman training and his years on the continent seemed to promise a peculiar fitness to aid in the reorganization of the English Church. But quick as Theodore had been to act, he was keen to see that Chad was one the Church could not afford to lose and he welcomed this new field for the Northumbrian's holy zeal. Mercia, needing a bishop, had naturally turned to Northumbria, whence Christianity had come to her; Oswy as naturally had turned to the new primate, whose power in the Church he wished to see as unquestioned as he hoped to make his own in the State.

With no foreboding of the troubles that Wilfrid's tenacity and ambition would create for himself and for

Northumbria, Theodore turned next to Wessex where the Church had been maintaining through many vicissitudes a feeble and now bishopless existence. He found here Eleutherius, nephew of Agilbert, once Bishop of Wessex and afterward Bishop of Paris, where he had been Theodore's host when he was on his way to England. This Eleutherius Theodore made Bishop at Winchester. Thus in a single year every vacant see had been filled, and every bishop in England, save Wini at London, owed his position to Theodore. The foundation of union had been laid. The work of consolidation, co-ordination, revivification and extension could begin.

The English Churches resigned their independence without resistance and, as it seems, without regret. Most obvious among many causes of this was the temporary disorganization in the south which followed the widespread mortality of 664. The most powerful direct influence was the wise statesmanship and strong will of Oswy. All who shared his wider vision of a united England naturally aided him in the effort to foster in this way a broader national spirit. He could count on the help of the clergy generally to rouse like aspirations among the people. Several men of talent who had had experience of continental discipline and organization also helped Theodore. Some of these, like Benedict Biscop, favoured a more elaborate ritual; others like Wilfrid might hope to find in an ecclesiastical system modelled on the continental a wider scope for their talents and ambitions. Thus the ground was prepared for Theodore whose character and abilities were commending him to all. But perhaps he won the favour of the clergy and the laity of all England less by this than because he came from Rome. They saw no cause to fear and they had much cause to love the Church of Rome. In this the Scots and the men of Northumbria whom they had converted were in no way behind the men of Wessex or of Kent. That Vitalian should have sent them Theodore seemed an honour merit-

ing grateful response. Whether any measure of subjection was involved in accepting the authority of one who had been sent to them in this way it is probable that neither clergy nor laity paused to consider, and had they done so they would have felt that they would be well able to safeguard their liberties if and when these should suffer encroachment. Rome in the seventh century had not yet the spirit or the power that came to it from the Carlovingians, who, following Oswy's example, sought to give to Rome the place in their polity that Canterbury had filled in his.

With 670 the English Church,—the name now first becomes a reality,—enters a new era. It has risen above the varying fortunes of petty states and beckons the nation to political union. In the Church the people first forgot that they were Angles, Saxons and Jutes and learned to think of themselves as Englishmen. Political supremacy had passed from state to state and brought jealousy and discord. The brotherhood of organized Christian unity softened the evils of civil strife and laid the foundations of a united kingdom. The primacy that had been asserted by Canterbury over Northumbria was not lasting; its power in the south in after years was varying and ill-defined. But from 670, as never before and always after, English Churchmen felt that they were united in spirit and aims, and worthy to claim a place in western Christendom beside the Churchmen of Gaul and of Italy.

England was however by no means as yet wholly Christian. A different organization of its work was needed for the further prosecution of its mission. This was Theodore's next care. In Kent he would have found a general outward conformity; in Northumbria and Mercia a more earnest faith in contest with a more open heathenism. Essex harboured a powerful heathen party; in Wessex Christianity was not yet generally professed; in Sussex it had made but feeble beginnings. But

every English ruler had been converted and Christianity had no serious rival. Even where it was weakest, heathenism, as an organized religion, was weaker. For this had never taken strong root since its transplantation from the continent. It offered no effective moral sanctions, no bulwark for civil order. With the examples of Ethelfrid and Penda on one side, of Ethelbert, Edwin and Oswald on the other, all English kings had come to see in the new faith not alone the religion of the future but the hope of present social order. They looked to the Church to consolidate their influence at home and to strengthen their power abroad. The union of the Churches that had been effected by Theodore in strengthening religion gave also new sanctions to civil authority. The kings were therefore disposed in advance to aid in the development of church organization and discipline without which union would have foregone its best fruits for the nation.

Organization and discipline Theodore furthered by persuasion and conference where he could, by authority where he must, and above all by education. Both he and Abbot Adrian were good scholars, Greek was his native tongue, Homer had been his constant companion on his journey from Italy; Adrian was at home in Latin, which was the language of school instruction and daily intercourse. He could teach Hebrew, too, and at Canterbury there was also instruction in medicine, always a help to the missionary. So thorough was the course that Bede, something more than a generation later, tells of disciples who "know Latin and Greek as well as they do their mother tongue". The choice youth flocked from all England to the new teachers. Here were educated, among other leaders of the next generation, John of Beverley, Aldhelm of Malmesbury and Albinus, afterward abbot and head of the school, who stirred Bede to write his Ecclesiastical History. Its example was widely followed, notably at Exeter, where even before Theodore's death Boniface was being educated for his mission to

the Germans; at Yarrow, where Bede was in turn pupil and teacher, and at York, whose school gave Albert to Northumbria and Alcuin to Charlemagne.

As soon as the school at Canterbury was fairly under way Theodore summoned all the bishops in England to meet him at Hereford in September, 673. Such councils had long been regarded on the Continent as essential to a healthy church life; the Council of Nice had decreed that they be held twice a year, but till now the political condition of England, dominating the ecclesiastical organizations, had not favoured it. It needed a prelate of Theodore's unquestioned authority to control conflicting local interests and racial jealousies to the general good. Even he did not venture to call the council till he had consolidated his position, nor did he declare his whole mind to the bishops when, with the sole exception of Wini, who, some say, had withdrawn from his see in 672, they had gathered or sent legates in response to his call. We are told that they summoned to their aid men skilled in canon law, but if Theodore's own account is to be accepted the guidance of the deliberations and the formulation of the decisions were wholly in his hands. "I asked each in order", he says, "if he were willing to abide by things canonically decreed by the Fathers of old". When they had readily given assent to this seemingly innocent question the shrewd prelate "immediately produced to them the book of canons itself, and out of it laid before them ten points", or rather nine out of the ten that he had set down, which, he says, "I knew were especially necessary for us", and asked that they be heartily accepted.

It is interesting to see what these "especially necessary" points were. The first was the Easter Canon of Antioch, which could now occasion no controversy in England. The second, "that no bishop should invade the see of another but be content with the government of the people (*plebs*) committed to him", meant more than

might at first hearing appear. Hitherto in England the bishop's authority, with a transitory and chance exception in Wessex, had been coextensive with the king's, expanding and contracting with the varying fortunes of war. Theodore meant to change this radically, though he did not then say so; he meant also to deprive all unattached British or Scottish bishops of episcopal functions, such as had been exercised in the case of Chad, and to this there was then no objection, though even ten years before there might have been. The third canon, which Theodore hardly found in his book, provided that "no bishop should disquiet monasteries dedicated to God, nor take by violence any of their possessions". Evidently the danger that the bishops, closely related to the secular powers, might abuse their office was more felt than the danger to Church and State that might come from monastic exemptions from necessary social burdens. The bishops approved the canon. Most of them were themselves founders of religious houses which they might wish to secure from the aggressions of a successor. Some of these might have heard that in Spain bishops had been known to treat monks as slaves and monastic estates as their private property. Then, too, the legal advisors of the bishops were all monks. As yet there had been no abuse of power on either side and no friction. When long afterward the inevitable conflict of interests arose the monasteries proved at fault rather than the bishops.

But if monasteries were to be safe-guarded, they themselves must submit to discipline. The fourth canon provided that monks must not wander from house to house without the abbot's leave. This provision was taken from the Benedictine Rule and was intended to prepare the way for that Rule's general adoption as well as for stricter control. A fifth canon secured a corresponding strengthening of episcopal authority. It forbade any cleric to leave his diocese without commendatory letters and enjoined any bishop from receiving such an one. To

forbid priests to wander at will was in itself a fatal blow to the irregular missionary work of the Scots, but, that there might be no possible misunderstanding, the sixth canon declared that foreign bishops and clergy should "be content with our hospitality" and perform no office without the diocesan's permission. In his seventh canon Theodore proposed semi-annual provincial synods such as had been provided by the Nicene rule. This the bishops thought too much under existing conditions and they voted unanimously for annual meetings at Clovesho, of which there are occasional records up to 747, though where Clovesho was seems now impossible to discover.

The eighth canon wisely fixed the precedence of bishops by the date of their consecration, an old rule in Africa and the only one that could prevent national jealousies in divided England. It could not wholly preclude controversy, however, as may be seen from the record of this very synod, where Wilfrid's representatives rank between Putta and Eleutherius, two bishops of Theodore's appointment, showing that the primate dated Wilfrid's claim to York, not, as he himself did, from 665, when he had been consecrated in Gaul, with what he chose later to regard as an inalienable claim to that see, but from 669 when Theodore had placed him there.

A last canon dealt with the domestic life of the faithful. It forbids adultery, incest and divorce, save for fornication, and concludes: "If any man expel his legitimate wife, if he will be true Christian let him be united to no other but remain as he is or be reconciled to his own wife." This canon touches a matter the treatment of which long vexed missionaries among all Teutonic peoples and has given trouble since in many heathen lands. The English had inherited ideas of the marriage relation hardly to be reconciled with Christianity. A procrustean rule would have caused great hardship and might even have hindered the cause it was meant to further. It has been questioned whether the last clause of the canon refers to an adulterous

wife or to an "innocent party", but since Theodore's manual of penance actually imposes penalties on a husband who continues to live with an adulterous wife, and allows the wronged, and even the guilty, party to contract a new marriage in such case, it is probable that the scope of this canon is confined to the case of a man who should refuse to harbour an innocent wife. This council, closing thus with a plea for the sanctity and inviolability of the home, was the first national gathering in England, the forerunner of all the councils and the parliaments that were to follow.

There was another canon in Theodore's "book". It proposed that new bishops should be created and the old sees divided as the number of the faithful grew. But of this, says the shrewd primate, "we were silent for the present". A little cautious questioning had probably given him assurance that the plan, if discussed, would meet with tenacious opposition, and he wished this first council to have no discordant note or rankling memory. So he did not press the matter to a decision. Possibly it was not formally mentioned at all. But his mind was set on the change and rightly, for it made, and it was essential to make, the bishops largely independent of the sectional strifes of rival kingdoms. It increased the authority of the primate and it made episcopal supervision of the territory a physical possibility. Six bishops could not then, with the utmost diligence, have supplied England's need, if the baptized were to be confirmed and all stations visited. There could be no co-ordination of the work in a diocese like Wilfrid's which covered all York, Lancashire, Westmoreland, Cumberland, Northumberland and part of Lothian. The Mercian See was nearly as large. The Bishop of Rochester alone could have hoped to give adequate care to his district. But the bishops clung to the idea that see and realm must be co-terminous. Each would have felt his dignity imperilled. Theodore wisely contented himself with a silent resolve

to deal with the dioceses separately before they had been welded to opposition by discussion. He had the will and the power. As occasion offered or called for action he would act.

The council had hardly dissolved, before an opportunity came to show in practice and without creating friction how Theodore's plan would work. Bisi, on account of growing feebleness which Theodore had perhaps foreseen, resigned his see in East Anglia. The king was, as usual, amenable to the primate's wish, which may well have accorded with his own independent judgment. The see was divided and two bishops consecrated in place of one. But East Anglia was one of the smallest sees. Northumbria and Mercia called for more radical changes. In Mercia the death of the king in 675 offered an occasion for intervention, but for the moment Theodore contented himself with removing Bishop Winfrid, for some unspecified "disobedience", very possibly a too frank expression of opposition to a division of his diocese. In Winfrid's place he put Sexulf, a man on whose co-operation he could count, should the new king prove refractory. In the same year Wini's death made it possible for Theodore to give to Essex as bishop Erconwald, a man of sanctified energy quite after the primate's own heart. In the next year Bishop Eleutherius died, but Wessex was then in a state of anarchy and there could be no thought of dividing this diocese. Heddi, the new bishop, was consecrated at London, and it was some years before he was able to establish himself definitely at Winchester.

Meantime there had occurred an incident that shows very strikingly the new spirit Theodore had inspired in the Churches. Ethelred, the new king of Mercia, had made a fierce attack on Kent, "destroying churches and monasteries pitilessly, without fear of God". Putta did not wait to see the storm burst over Rochester, but took refuge with Sexulf, the bishop of the very country to which he owed his misfortune. Sexulf gave the fugitive

a church and a small grant of land, where he passed the rest of his life, becoming a little later the first Bishop of Hereford. The act gives expression to a new sense of brotherhood and solidarity among English Churchmen, a change marvellous when it is remembered that it was still but seven years since Theodore came to England.

Putta was replaced at Rochester by a certain Cwichelm, who presently resigned. Gebmund was selected to succeed him. Theodore's action here, however arbitrary, found unquestioning obedience, as indeed it did throughout all Southern England. Through these seven years he had been gathering strength and he now felt able to grapple with the situation in Northumbria, which, from his point of view, was the most serious of all. The see was the largest, the kingdom the strongest. Wilfrid was far the most ambitious and energetic of the native English bishops and his temper was as unbending as Theodore's own. He had enjoyed the favour of King Oswy and until but a little while before had possessed the confidence of that king's successor, Egfrid. Aided munificently by the new king and queen he had built and beautified churches in a way till then unparalleled in England. Nine monasteries, rich in land and well organized, were under his direct control. The Benedictine Rule was generally observed, Gregorian music taught and a school opened for the sons of the nobility. Wilfrid had even felt powerful enough to assist Queen Etheldred in thwarting the royal will, and after she had withdrawn to a cloister he had refused to sanction a second marriage of the king. Relations between the bishop and the court had thus come to be as strained as those between Wilfrid and the older clergy had always been, when Egfrid, wishing to press the conflict to an issue, invited Theodore to come to Northumbria.

Theodore took immediate advantage of the king's vexation. Without consulting Wilfrid, he appointed three bishops for districts embracing considerable por-

tions of the kingdom, which recent conquests had much enlarged. When Wilfrid heard of this, for apparently he had not been at York when Theodore came there and had perhaps avoided a meeting, he immediately challenged the authority of the newly appointed bishops, and, when they would not yield to him, he appealed for at least moral support to Rome, whither in 678 he set sail with ostentatious publicity.

Neither King nor Archbishop seems to have been much exercised by Wilfrid's act. When, after many adventures by the way, he reached Rome, he found the Curia already occupied with English affairs. Abbess Hilda had representatives there, and Theodore also. The Curia was not disposed to discourage any resort to its counsels or its jurisdiction, but it was as little disposed to thwart Theodore in the work he was prosecuting with such obvious success. It gave Wilfrid an answer that might encourage him in his claim but did not hinder, indeed may even have helped to cause, his imprisonment and exile on his return to Northumbria.

Wilfrid went first to Mercia then to Wessex and finally to Sussex, biding his time, till in 685 the fortunes of war smoothed the way back to Northumbria. Theodore, meanwhile, had consecrated two more bishops for Northumbria and had intervened in a quarrel between that realm and Mercia, with an authority that no bishop in England had till then ventured to assume. With a really marvellous versatility this Greek of seventy-five years had grasped a main principle of Teutonic law, radically different from the Roman and had turned it skilfully to his purpose. A *wer-geld* appeased the wrath of Egfrid.

Mercia was now promptly divided into five, possibly six, dioceses. Then the primate's attention was diverted from his work as political peacemaker and ecclesiastical organizer to an assertion before the Catholic world of the orthodoxy of England. A Roman synod in 679,

after undertaking to fix the number of English sees at twelve with bounds to be set by the archbishop, had advised that an English synod be held to report to the Pope's representative on the faith of that Church regarding the "two natural wills and energies" in Our Lord. Even the support of Ultima Thule was not to be neglected by the Pope in his great monotheistic controversy with the East. A council was duly convoked at Hatfield and "in all the Catholic faith was found inviolate". At the close of the council the bishops joined in a profession of faith notable for the inclusion of the *filioque* clause which had long found acceptance in Spain and Africa, but is not in Pope Agatho's exposition put forth in 679. Thus the united English Church was able to make its voice heard in the development of doctrine, as the divided Churches had never done and could not do.

Political changes in Northumbria now led Theodore to consider the practicability of Wilfrid's return. This, under suitable conditions, the Archbishop desired, for it would show deference to the Curia and to Wilfrid's new royal patron, Cedwalla of Wessex, already obviously the strongest ruler in England and completely dominant in Kent. Theodore wished especially to conciliate him for the royal favour would smooth the path for his own successor. It was Theodore's noble ambition to die leaving no breach unhealed in the English Church. The death of King Egfrid of Northumbria furnished the occasion. Theodore arranged with his successor Aldfrid, a friend of Wilfrid from old time, for the exile's recall and met Wilfrid at London, on his way northward, to discuss with him the terms on which he might be received in Northumbria. Wilfrid was allowed to administer temporarily the then vacant see of Hexham and afterward was given the much restricted see of York which he was still holding at Theodore's death, though he was to suffer a new expulsion a year later. Wilfrid continued to assert his claims, as occasion offered, in England and at Rome

and, through political intervention, obtained a very partial restoration at last. Theodore's action showed that no personal feeling had influenced him. He had been guided by what he felt essential for the well-being of the Church and was content to have placed beyond question that subdivision of the diocese which was necessary to its efficient administration.

Theodore had built so wisely and so diligently that the last ten years of his life were passed in comparative calm in Kent, where his presence perhaps helped to defer the conquest by the West-Saxons that followed soon after his death. Kent became a tributary kingdom and never regained independence. It speaks much for the soundness of Theodore's work that this political subordination of Kent in no way affected the ecclesiastical precedence of Canterbury. The Church had achieved a unity quite independent of the rise or fall of the secular powers. All through Southern England the monasteries were becoming the centres of church life, aiding much in social development and the growth of towns, while in Kent, at least, the Church was fast becoming the only hope of order, the sole refuge for the oppressed. After an interval of well earned rest Theodore died in peaceful dignity at Canterbury, in 690, the vigour and the keenness of his mind, in spite of his eighty-nine years, undiminished to the last.

Changes great and decisive in almost every sphere of English life had been wrought in the twenty-one years of his primacy, and in all that affected the unity of the Church and the moral uplift of the people he had been so far the leader that without him none of them would have been as they were, many of them might have waited long for realization or never have been realized at all. From the political conflicts of the time he had, as a rule, held himself strictly aloof, watching the growing power of Wessex and perhaps discovering already in Cedwalla's successor Ine the promise of Egbert and Alfred. That

Kent should be absorbed in the dominant kingdom would not mar the position he had made for Canterbury.

It is indeed one of the ironies of history that Oswy should have realized from his resort to Vitalian all and more than all that he anticipated for the Church and yet nothing of the ulterior benefits that he had expected for his dynasty and his kingdom. Oswy almost touched that supremacy among English kings which none till then had approached, but the coveted prize eluded his grasp and to his successor it was truly a dissolving view. Theodore, whose mission had been invited as a bulwark of Northumbrian sovereignty, lived to see the northern kingdom in irremediable confusion and exhaustion. Mercia, the middle kingdom, second of the great powers of 669, had also passed the crest of its strength. It still exercised an ill-defined ascendancy in East Anglia and Essex, but Wessex, with the prestige of recent success, already controlling Sussex and about to absorb Kent, showed the shifting of political leadership to the south where the type of Churchmanship that Theodore represented had always been most at home.

But however these changes favoured the realization of that primacy for Canterbury that Augustine had been sent to claim two generations before, they would have availed little without the singular statesmanship, wisdom and vision of that monk who had been taken from a Roman cloister at sixty-six and changed the face of the English Church. Already on the verge of the proverbial three-score years and ten he had till then given no proof of latent powers to mould men and events with consistent purpose to a great end. He was, Bede tells us, "venerated for his character and his age", but surely it was a great act of faith to commit to him the upbuilding and rejuvenation of the Church among a people of whose language and national traditions he was ignorant. It is hard to find a parallel in history to his achievement. Standing himself beyond the rivalries of sections and parties, he lifted

his fellow-churchmen above them that by their example the English people might learn, as they did learn, a wider patriotism and gain a vision of a national unity. Here his work can hardly be overestimated. Without Theodore it is difficult to see how there could have been an Alfred.

Theodore came to England at an age when most men are ready to lay aside old tasks and shrink from new burdens. He found the land in ecclesiastical anarchy. But two sees were worthily filled, a third was tainted with simony, the rest had no bishops at all. When he died sixteen bishops owned the primacy of Canterbury. He came, indeed, at an opportune moment. Even his great and unsuspected gifts would not have sufficed for the task before the barrier between North and South had been broken by the conversion of the political leaders of Mercia, and before ritual agreement had been assured by the development of a new state of mind among the guides of opinion in church and state that found expression at the Synod of Whitby. His iron will needed the assurance of secular support but he knew how to secure this without the sacrifice of any ecclesiastical principle. He found in England an exceptional group of churchmen. Chad was, indeed, a survivor of an older system but in Cuthbert, as abbot and bishop, in Abbess Hilda, in Biscop and in Wilfrid he found talented and in the main sympathetic helpers. Yet it is much that he knew how to use all these leaders of differing and sometimes discordant tendencies and suffered none of them to deflect him from his reconciling, constructive mission. No Englishman before the Norman Conquest did any work for the English Church comparable in import to that of this Greek monk.

The dioceses, once shifting with the fortunes of war, were now, except in Wessex, of fixed bounds and manageable size. They found their limits in the ancient tribal distinctions of the settlers rather than in those "natural boundaries" that often prove the most artificial of all.

So the Church was adapted to the Teutonic spirit in which the tie of blood had always been notably strong. With Theodore's instinct for orderly administration we are not surprised to find that he, first in England, so far as we know, ordained priests and deacons for specific service and so created new ties to bind the people to the Church. Those have been on the right track, though they may have gone too far on it, who have attributed to Theodore, as does the Monk of Elmham, the introduction of a fully developed parochial system, but at least he had made this so obviously the next step that it soon became general not only in England but in English foreign missions. Willibrord, for instance, had introduced the system in Frisia before the end of the century. The step was a very important one, for it first offered the possibility of what in these days, when men think in militant metaphor, we may call the mobilization of religious opinion. To co-ordinate the discipline in these segregated cures and to maintain solidarity in the moral life of the people Theodore also compiled for his clergy a penitential manual which was a model for imitation, not in England alone, but on the continent for many generations, nor amid all his far-off purposes did he ever lose sight of the conviction with which he had begun, that in an educated ministry lay the best hope of the realization of his aims. That hope was soon to be richly justified in Boniface who, because of the education he was able to get in a West-Saxon cloister school from a former adviser of the king, became fit to cope with problems in Germany very similar to those that had been solved by Theodore while Boniface was still a schoolboy in England.

The aims of Theodore were all constructive. They all were guided by an ideal of co-ordinated effort and unity in faith and in order. If he pulled down, it was that he might immediately set up on better assured foundations. He stayed the feuds of princes by his presence and made the voice of his Church heard in the councils of the

Catholic world. Even where he had seemed most arbitrary none but Wilfrid had protested, for all saw his earnest purpose and foresaw the good result. He proved equal to the largest tasks imposed on him, yet he thought it not beneath his dignity to teach in his school the rudiments of science, language and mental discipline to those in whom he saw promise of future good to the church to whose service, a stranger from a strange land, he had given himself wholeheartedly. No other of the Anglo-Saxon Church reaches his stature; indeed it is given to few in any land or any sphere to build so wisely on foundation so sure that their work shall endure and invite to ever greater upbuilding, even after twelve hundred years.

THE
CONSTRUCTIVE
QUARTERLY

The Movement Towards Church Unity

By David S. Schaff, D.D.,
Professor of Ecclesiastical History and History of Doctrine, Western Theological Seminary, Pittsburgh.

If by Unity is meant agreement in all matters pertaining to religious authority and administration, then the Apostolic Church did not have it. If, however, by Church Unity is meant devotion to Christ as the Son of God and the Redeemer of the world and a life conformed to his precepts and example, then the Apostolic Church had it. The differences between Paul and Peter were sharp and sharply discussed. At Corinth there were different parties. Baur, in his famous treatment of these Corinthian parties published in 1831, may have gone too far in emphasizing the differences between them. But the differences were serious; otherwise Paul would not have taken pains to make note of them. The council of

Jerusalem in 51 recognized differences, and seems also to have recognized a division of the world into two parishes, Gentile and Judaic, the Gospel of the uncircumcision being committed to Paul and the Gospel of the circumcision to Peter. It was certainly more than a passing remark of the Apostle when he wrote: "There are diversities of ministrations but the same Lord: and there are diversities of workings but the same God who worketh all things in all." On the pages of the New Testament, one centre of Church Unity seems to be revealed and only one, Jesus Christ as the Son of God and the Saviour of the world.

Leaving the New Testament, we find very early in the history of the post-apostolic Church the position taken that the bishop is the centre of unity. This was the position taken by Ignatius. For him, however, the bishop was the representative of Christ and not the representative of the Apostles, and it would seem to be evident from his pages and the condition of the churches in that age, that Ignatius' episcopate was congregational, a presidency within the bounds of one congregation, as Justin Martyr a generation later seems to have had in mind when he called the chief officer in the church the "president". However this may be, Cyprian, who died in 258, gave the episcopal theory its final form and strongest statement. According to him, the episcopate is in the succession of the Apostles and to it are committed the deposit of faith and the office of teaching. His idea succinctly expressed in the words *ecclesia est in episcopo* emphasized the unitive position of the bishop and also that the bishop is essential to the church—no bishop, no church.

Along with this idea of the episcopate as the centre of unity was developed the idea that the acceptance of a formulated statement of doctrine is a condition of church communion. Such doctrinal symbols became a bond of unity and fellowship. The Athanasian creed, so called,

went so far as to make the acceptance of its own highly polished trinitarian statements essential to salvation. "This is the catholic faith", are its concluding words, "which if a man believe not truly and firmly he cannot be saved." Different schools of opinion there were in the Church until majorities constructed the Nicene creed and the Constantinopolitan statement and other articles. Dissenters were proscribed as heretics and to heretics the victorious party, including Athanasius, attached the most opprobrious names. Other questions than our Lord's deity and the union of the two natures in his single person divided the Church, such as the validity of heretical baptism and the restoration of the lapsed to church membership. Rome and North Africa took different positions on these questions. The Donatists were exceptionally rigorous in their definition of the Church, but in the interest of "the one holy Catholic Church", they, too, were branded as heretics.

From the time of Leo I (450), a third centre of Church Unity was definitely developed in the West. From his day on, with Gregory I as a notable exception, the Roman pontiff has proclaimed himself the supreme ruler of the Church universal on earth, being the successor of Peter and the vicar of Christ. For centuries this view ruled in Western Christendom, and Thomas Aquinas, who first introduced the discussion of the papacy into the theological system, gave it formal statement from the side of the theologian. This supreme and unitive position of the papacy, reaffirmed with tremendous emphasis by the Vatican council, was thus stated by Leo XIII in an encyclical of June 29, 1896:

"As he willed his kingdom should be visible, Christ was obliged to designate a vicegerent on earth in the person of St. Peter. He also determined that the authority given him for the salvation of mankind in perpetuity should be inherited by St. Peter's successors. . . . The power of St. Peter is supreme and absolutely independent so that, having no other power on earth as its superior, it embraces the whole church and all things committed to the church."

Thus we have three centres of Church Unity,—Christ alone, the bishop, and the Roman pontiff.

In the ninth century came the great rupture "in the holy catholic apostolic Church", dividing Christendom into the Greek and Latin communions. The bitterness shown in that day has suffered no abatement with the passage of the centuries. Of this I had an illustration in an interview granted me by the Greek Patriarch of Jerusalem, Nicholas. During the interview the prelate was calm and exceedingly agreeable in manner, until I turned the conversation to the Bishop of Rome and the relations of Greek and Latin Christendom, when his whole manner and bearing changed. Patriarch of the West the Oriental Churches are willing to grant that he is, but nothing further. The two official efforts made in these ten later centuries to heal the rupture and to unite the two communions, Greek and Latin, at the oecumenical councils of Lyons, 1274, and Ferrara, 1439, proved futile. For six centuries the effort has not been repeated.

Then came the Protestant Reformation, making a cleavage as wide in the Western Church as the cleavage made in the days of Photius and Pope Nicholas I. And it remains unhealed after 400 years. Three attempts in as many colloquies were made during Luther's life to reconcile Protestant and Roman Catholic. Perhaps from reasons of state, Charles V was more concerned to bring about a reconciliation and reunion than any one else. He called the colloquies. Calvin, Melanchthon, Brenz, Bucer took part. Luther stood aloof, holding them to be a waste of time and money—*dass man Zeit verlieren, Geld verzehren und zu Haus alles versäumen würde.* It was a drastic view of the case but justified by the issue. The agreement of Regensburg satisfied neither Pope nor Protestant. The emperor clung to the idea of reunifying the Western Church, hanging his hopes on the council of Trent, the council which served only to distinguish more clearly between Protestantism and Catholicism. Bossuet and

Leibnitz pondered over schemes for their reunion, but the Tridentine council was an insuperable barrier to union. Bossuet would have allowed explanations but no retractions. The line of separation has been made broader by the doctrinal announcements during the pontificate of Pius IX.

As for Protestantism, one of the chief charges brought against it is that its principles lead easily to division and sectarianism. In magnifying the independence of the individual, it has endangered external authority and the unity of the body. Historically the charge admits of proof. All over Europe, Lutheran fought against Calvinist. Perhaps no more determinedly than Dominicanism against Jesuitism. Nevertheless they contended, and one of the three or four great mistakes of Luther's career was that he refused Ulrich Zwingli's hand at Marburg, in 1529. In Holland, the Spanish Inquisition was worn out by the steadfastness of the Dutch people and the opposition of France to Spain, but Arminianism and Calvinism marched against each other with doctrinal flags unfurled and carnal weapons unsheathed. In England, Puritan clashed with Anglican and if Anglicanism, by its Uniformity statutes made the Puritan an alien in his native land, Puritanism, getting into power, oppressed back by punishing with imprisonment the use of the Book of Common Prayer. It was, however, under the Puritan régime in 1653, that Parliament, voting indulgence to all professing the fundamentals, appointed a committee to draw up a list of them. It was an honourable and broad-minded idea. In later times, George Fox and John Wesley, to preach the Gospel in England and America as they understood it, broke away from the national ecclesiastical connection; their followers, however, were among the first to legislate against slavery and the liquor traffic. It is one of the painful memories that the two brothers John and Charles Wesley, so closely united in brotherly affection and labours, should be

separated in their places of burial, the one in consecrated ground, the other in unconsecrated, though joined, it is true, in the monument at Westminster.

In France, the Huguenots had scarcely emerged from the hard oppression following the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes when they broke up into divisions and strife. In Scotland, the Church was split again and again over the general question of patronage, down to the last great rupture in 1843. Protestant history is marked by many battlefields but by much heroism, by many divisions but also by philanthropic and missionary endeavours and strivings after full liberty of conscience.

This divisive movement had pretty well spent its force before the nineteenth century opened. Before that date a centralizing and unitive force had begun to manifest itself in the foreign missionary movement, the anti-slavery and other humanitarian movements and a little later, in the Bible Societies,—all having for their purpose the spread of Christ's truth and grace. These were the first visible manifestations of co-operation among English churchmen of different organizations. There had not been wanting, however, voices which were raised in favour of Church Unity in England. In the early part of the eighteenth century, and after the issue of the papal bull condemning Gallicanism and Jansenism, Archbishop Wake was in correspondence with Du Pin and other scholars of the Gallican Church with an eye to a possible union of the Anglican and Gallican Churches. And it was in this atmosphere that the learned Benedictine, Dr. Courayer, wrote his work showing the validity of Anglican orders. Richard Baxter had proposed terms of Church Reunion, and John Durie had laboured in England and in Germany to bring it about. But nothing in the way of co-operation followed. The heavy controversial artillery of Cardinal Bellarmine called forth replies from the well equipped breastworks in England, and for another half century the polemical spirit ruled.

By the middle of the nineteenth century, the unitive force which had begun to show itself in practical and missionary movements, a half century before, found expression in a grouping whose distinctive purpose was to promote Christian fellowship and recognition among the different Protestant denominations,—the Evangelical Alliance, founded in 1846. Its nine articles included all Protestants, except the Friends and Unitarians, and Protestants of all lands and languages. Its motto, *unum corpus sumus in Christo*—we are one body in Christ—magnified unity and pointed out the centre of it. The Conference, which met in New York City 1873, was perhaps the most influential religious gathering held in this country during the last century. Its members, including the Dean of Canterbury, Dr. Payne Smith and Dr. Cummins, Assistant-Bishop of Kentucky, sat down together at the Lord's table.[1]

The spirit fostered by the Evangelical Alliance found further expression in federations of historic Protestant groups,—the Lambeth Conference of Episcopal Churches, 1867, the Alliance of the Reformed Churches, sometimes called the Pan-Presbyterian Alliance, 1876, the Oecumenical of Methodists, 1881, the International Council of the Congregational Churches, 1891, the Baptist World Conference, 1905; all consultative and marking a step in advance of the Alliance.

Then came with an emphasis upon co-operation in Christian work and the defence of the Gospel, the National Council of Evangelical Free Churches of England

[1] The dean was much criticized at the time and, soon after the communion, which was held in the Madison Square Presbyterian Church, then under the pastoral care of Dr. William Adams, Bishop Cummins withdrew from the Protestant Episcopal Church and became the founder of the Reformed Episcopal Church. The papers read at this Conference of 1873 on Church Unity and Church Union by such men as Prof. Charles Hodge of Princeton, Dean Smith of Canterbury, Bishop Bedell of Ohio, Dr. Muhlenberg, President Potter of Union College, and others, are well worthy of reperusal. See *Proceedings of the Evangelical Alliance, 1873;* pp. 139–199 (Harper & Bros., 1874).

and Wales, which prepared the Free Church Catechism, 1898, and the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, 1905, with thirty Christian bodies associated in it.

A further step, the organic union of different denominations, was taken within the bounds of American Presbyterianism in the coalescence of the Old and New School branches in 1870, and the union of the Presbyterian Church North and the Cumberland Presbyterians, in 1906, the union of the five Methodist Churches in Canada, 1874, and four Presbyterian, in 1875, and the union of the Free and United Scotch Presbyterian Churches in 1901. Other unions are impending here and in England, but the proposed union of the Methodist, Congregational and Presbyterian bodies in Canada seems to be postponed on account of the large number of Presbyterians voting against it—146,242 as against 193,156 in favour of organic union.

In speaking of the movement towards Church Unity among English-speaking Protestants, we must not forget the movement in Prussia which resulted in the union of the Lutheran and Reformed elements in the Evangelical Church, to which the King of Prussia belongs. Nor may we forget the notable encouragement given to the cause of Church Unity by the co-operation of Protestant bodies on the mission fields and the union of such bodies as the Reformed and Presbyterian bodies in Brazil, Corea, Japan and India.

This survey has brought us to the Church Unity movement inaugurated by the Protestant Episcopal Church which, according to Dr. Briggs, is the "fullest and strongest expression in recent times of the aspirations for the reunion of Christendom".[2] The first chapter in the history of this movement dates from 1886, the second from 1910. The first opened with the Declaration of the bishops of the Protestant Episcopal Church, meeting in

[2] *Church Unity*, p. 73.

Chicago, 1886. After pronouncing the restoration of the unity of the Church to be an end most desirable, this announcement declared that the Episcopal Church

"does not seek to absorb other communions but, rather co-operating with them on the basis of a common faith and order, to discountenance schism, to heal the wounds of the body of Christ and to promote charity which is the chief of the Christian graces and the visible manifestation of Christ in the world."

It further declared that unity can only be secured by returning to the principles in force in the first ages of the Church's history and defined as the four essential elements of such unity the sacred deposit of truth handed down in the Scriptures, the two sacraments as instituted by Christ, the Nicene Creed as a sufficient statement of the Christian faith, and the historic episcopate locally adapted in the methods of its administration. The bishops followed up this Declaration with the appointment of a committee of fifteen to communicate "with the organized Christian bodies seeking restoration of the organic unity of the Church".

The four articles, since known as the Quadrilateral, were adopted by the Lambeth Conference in 1888, with some modifications, the chief of which was the addition of the Apostles Creed in article three. The non-episcopal body with which negotiations were carried on longest and, as it would seem, with most interest on both sides was the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America. The Assembly of this body, in replying to the communication of the Episcopal committee, expressed its cordial sympathy with the growing desire of the evangelical Christian Churches for practical unity and co-operation, and announced itself as looking forward "if not to a formal oneness of organization at least to hearty fellowship and ministerial reciprocity". Such "mutual recognition and reciprocity" it pronounced the first and essential step toward practical Church Unity. So far as the four articles went, the Assembly accepted the first three but in regard to the fourth declared that it accepted the his-

toric episcopate in the sense of the presbyter-bishop "in practice till this day". It, at the same time, stated that the Assembly was not disposed to constrain others to adopt its interpretation of the New Testament in that particular matter. The communications which were opened in 1887 were brought to a close in 1896. Bishop A. Cleveland Coxe, then chairman of the Episcopal committee, not accepting the Assembly's deliverance as a clear and final statement of its position, sought to bring it to some further formulation, calling attention "to the primitive faith and order of the Church as exhibited in an age when there was no visible division". The Assembly, however, felt that its statement was sufficiently clear, and, in 1896, discontinued the correspondence, announcing "that it could not negotiate on the subject of church unity with another Christian body except on terms of parity".

The second chapter in the Church Unity movement opened in 1910 with a second Declaration by the House of Bishops of the Episcopal Church, meeting in Cincinnati. This Declaration affirmed that there

> "is today among all Christian people a growing desire for the fulfilment of our Lord's prayer that all his disciples may be one, that the world may believe that God sent him".

To give formal expression to this feeling, it appointed a Joint Commission on Faith and Order, assigning to it the duty of

> "bringing about a Conference for the consideration of questions touching Faith and Order and that all Christian communions throughout the world which confess our Lord Jesus Christ as God and Saviour be asked to unite with us in arranging for and conducting such a Conference".

It is to be noted that the proposal stops with the assembling of a general Conference which shall discuss questions of Faith and Order. In arranging for this Conference all Christian communions accepting the invitation shall have equal part. It is also to be noted that the definition of Faith and Order is not attempted. Sup-

posing that by Faith are meant questions of doctrinal import, it is uncertain whether or not by Order are included all those things which pertain to church worship, church government and more particularly to clerical orders.

It is well at this point to bear in mind that the Council of the Congregational Churches, on October 18, 1910, anticipated by one day the House of Bishops in passing a resolution expressing its deep interest in Church Unity, quoting the words of the Lambeth Conference that the "Council desires not compromise but comprehension, not uniformity but unity" and at the same time recalling the fact that "their forefathers were not willingly Separatists". The last statement is of prime historic significance in bearing witness to the feelings with which the earliest Puritans laid the foundation of their church life at Salem and also to that historic religious struggle which, beginning formally with the Act of Uniformity in 1559, resulted in the development and growth of the Nonconformist bodies of England.

At the same time, and also independently, the Church of the Disciples, in convention at Topeka, passed a resolution of similar import. The Northern Presbyterian Church, not a whit behind, appointed a permanent Committee on Church Co-operation and Union, a committee whose duty it is to further the cause and act with any committees of a similar intent appointed by other ecclesiastical bodies.

The Joint Commission on Faith and Order appointed by the Episcopal Church, with Bishop Anderson of Chicago as chairman and Dr. W. T. Manning of Trinity Church, New York, as secretary, has been constantly at work, and in its invitations has not only included other Protestant communions but also the Greek and Latin Churches. Two delegations have visited Great Britain and Ireland. The one, representing the Episcopal Church, consisting of Dr. Manning and three bishops, met in

1911 representatives of the Anglican Church and the Episcopal Churches of Scotland and Ireland. It also had interviews with Archbishop Platon of the Russian Church and Cardinal Gibbons. The second delegation, representing the united Commission and consisting of Drs. W. H. Roberts, Newman Smyth and Peter Ainslie, met in 1914 with thirty-one groups belonging to the non-episcopal bodies of Great Britain and Ireland. Thus far fifty-eight Christian communions and associations have united in joining the movement. The Anglican Church has taken the attitude of a watchful and interested spectator, ready to participate, as it has officially declared, when the opportune time comes.

The zeal of the Joint Commission has also been shown in the issue of twenty-seven leaflets each of from eight to fifty pages in length. On the face page of these leaflets are printed in Greek, Latin and English our Lord's words (John 17: 21) "That they may all be one; even as thou Father art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us: that the world may believe that thou hast sent me", the passage on which Cardinal Sadolet laid much stress in his letter to the Genevans, appealing to them to return to the bosom of the Roman communion—a letter which called forth Calvin's brilliant reply six months later, 1539.

The different participating communions have appointed commissions and the totality of the commissions constitute the Commission on Faith and Order. At the first conference, held May 8, 1913, in New York, seventeen communions were represented. The next step forward was the conference, meeting January 4-6 of this year in Garden City, and participated in by eighty delegates.

At the Garden City conference it became clear that, for the present at least, the Protestant bodies only are to take part in the Church Unity movement. The presentation of the subject to Archbishop Platon has gone no further in the Eastern Church. As for the Latin Church,

a letter from Benedict XV settled its position. After a courteous assurance that he would look with interest upon the progress of the movement and offer his prayers in behalf of its object, Benedict pointed out that Church Unity inheres in the papacy. The letter runs: "With the voice of Christ himself sounding before and bidding him, the pontiff knows that he himself, as the one to whom all men have been given over to be fed, is the source and cause of the unity of the church." And this unity of faith and fellowship, as the letter continues, is built upon St. Peter. The pope could not have said less without breaking with the historic utterances of his predecessors and with the Vatican decree of 1870 which, reaffirming an old opinion "pronounced the pope the Head of the whole church, the father and teacher of all Christians whom all pastors and the faithful alike are to obey". Indeed, it would seem that at best solicitation of fraternal intercourse on the part of the Anglican and Episcopal Churches with the Roman Catholic communion can amount to nothing more than a testimony to their good purpose and kindly feelings. The encyclical of Leo XIII, 1896, pronouncing Anglican orders invalid, seems to have shut the door from the side of the Catholic Church; and to non-Episcopalians this encyclical would seem to mean that in the eyes of good Catholics, Anglicans and Episcopalians no more belong to the Holy Catholic Church than do Baptists and Methodists and Presbyterians. Consequently, the movement towards Church Unity, for the present at least, is limited to the branches of Protestant Christendom.

The Garden City conference adopted three acts. It made provision for a council to serve as an executive committee, to consist of one delegate from each of the participating Christian bodies and an additional representative for each 500,000 communicants. It made provision for a committee of experts, or theologians, to prosecute researches and prepare data showing the agree-

ments and disagreements of the ecclesiastical bodies represented and to "deduce the points that appear to be held substantially in common and those which appear to be regarded as grounds for separate organization". More particularly, it determined the subjects to be taken up by these experts, namely the Church, its nature and functions; grace and the sacraments; the ministry, its nature and functions. It also provided that each commission shall think and act "in terms of the whole".

Thus preparation is fairly under way for the World Conference on Faith and Order proposed by the House of Bishops in 1910. No date is as yet set for the conference. Dr. Manning and others, agreeing with him, are of the mind that the object will be best served by moving slowly to the end that time may be given for much prayer and for the subject of Church Unity itself to be presented seriously to a wider constituency and also that the Holy Spirit may be left free to guide the movement as he will.

Explain it as we may, there seems to be unmistakable evidence that within the pale of the Protestant Episcopal Church there exists a very serious and pressing impulse in the direction of Church Unity. This is evident not only from the twofold action of the House of Bishops but from the statements of individual Episcopalians, clergymen and laymen. And apparently it exists there in a form and with a devotional pressure as it does not exist in any of the non-Episcopalian Churches. But Church Unity is a consummation of such possible practical importance that no serious effort is to be treated lightly which seems to make in that direction. I have been told by persons belonging to the Presbyterian and Reformed bodies who attended the Conference at Garden City that it was a meeting of the rarest spiritual power and almost unequalled in their experience. A layman of long and varied observation added the testimony that he

had never before been in a meeting of equal spiritual feeling. Such testimony is in itself worthy of note and reflection. And it would seem that the subject of Church Unity in the Protestant Churches of the English-speaking world is now engaging the thought of a larger relative constituency than ever before since the days of the Reformers. The combinations in the commercial world, the unifications proposed by the science of sociology, the co-operative missionary movements, the theory of the conservation of force—whatever the exact scientific meaning of that expression may be—all these are moving Christian people to consider how they may unite their energies for the most efficient work.

Whatever be its ultimate tangible result, the Church Unity movement may be expected to accomplish great good. No gathering of Christian people can fail to have wholesome results when they come together with the pure purpose of enquiring the Lord's will and honouring his commands. The things in which the Protestant communions agree are of vastly greater import than the things which have been regarded as justifying separate organizations. The spirit of a generous competition, each provoking the other to good works, is not without its value, but single devotion to the Head of the Church is a matter of prime concern for the triumph of Christian truth and righteousness in the earth and to develop a people prepared for the Lord's coming. It is possible that a general council meeting at regular intervals may be developed, whose purpose it shall be to overlook the work of all the Protestant Churches as the conferences, conventions and assemblies of the distinct denominations now do. At any rate, the way should be made clear for the conservation of the Church's resources so that there shall be as little waste as possible of ministerial and financial strength. This will come through a combination of forces in city and village, in theological institutions and benevolent agencies, in parochial activities at

home and missionary operations abroad. A combination of agencies, of congregations where one can do better the work than the several now attempting it, of theological seminaries as at Montreal, of missionary boards, will be well worth the while. But it is quite possible that the result will be the emergence of a conviction that among Protestant Trinitarians there are at most four clans; the Episcopalians, focussing Church Unity in the episcopate, the Baptists, the Lutherans, (that party amongst them which holds to Luther's views without modification), and the Reformed, including the Methodist bodies; or, if you choose, a fifth clan, the Friends, who dispense with the outward administration of the sacraments. Within the limits of these groupings a strong movement may set in toward organic union.

Moreover, the Church Unity movement may be expected to call forth a patient and prayerful restudy of the New Testament in the light of present world problems and conditions. As a visitor to a great city sees with delight on one visit things to which on a previous visit he gave only a cursory glance, so it is with the Christian consciousness as it draws from the Scriptures at different periods. None of the Fathers, not even Chrysostom and Augustine, found in the Christian scheme a clear suggestion of the abolition of human slavery this side of the millennium. It was different thirteen hundred years later, when John Wesley called for the removal of what he chose to call the "execrable abomination"; the Quakers forbade their people holding slaves and Wilberforce pressed his motions for the abolition of the institution of slavery in the British colonies. If it be granted that the Reformers, in the light of the conditions prevalent in their time, did right in withdrawing from the obedience of the Roman pontiff, it may also be granted as possible that God in our age may make some great truth bearing upon the advancement of Christ's Kingdom through a movement of Church Unity to emerge from the Scriptures.

The words of Reverend John Robinson delivered to the Pilgrim emigrants have in them a progressive ring.

The study which the Church Unity movement calls for will make necessary a re-examination of fundamental positions which at one time or another have led Protestants to separate into distinct groups. It is not at all unlikely that the non-episcopal bodies will bear new witness to the unsacramental and unsacerdotal character of the Church and the ministry as set forth in the pages of the New Testament. They will find a priesthood but a priesthood of believers, not a priesthood mediating between Christ and the soul. They will investigate again to determine whether the ministry of the New Testament is not a charismatic ministry and ordination at the hands of man chiefly a matter of expediency or orderliness. They will search again for the credentials of St. Paul as he sets them forth in the Epistle to the Galatians. And they will ask why, if bishops are the successors of the presbyter-bishops of the Apostolic age, they are a different order from the presbyters, or, if it be alleged they are the successors of the Apostles, why they lost the name apostle and do not possess the qualification which Peter in the first chapter of the Acts laid down for a successor of Judas and why no mandate was given to the Apostles to appoint successors.

The test is coming when the three great questions proposed for discussion in the World Conference are seriously taken in hand. The ministry has been spoken of. The definition of the Church is perhaps even a more fundamental thing. Attention is being given to the study of Ecclesiology as never before in the history of the Church. There is a good deal said of the Church and of churches in the New Testament. To many the prime thought connected with the Church is that it is a body of persons who believe in Jesus Christ as God and Saviour; to others, that it is a closely guarded institution. The present official Catholic definition excludes all who do not

show obedience "to lawful pastors, especially the pope, the bishop of Rome, who is the vicar of Christ on earth and the visible head of the Church". That is the definition of the Catechism of Christian Doctrine prepared and enjoined by the Third Plenary Council of the United States. With essential modification, it has very ancient authority among Church teachers. But in its full form or its modified form, it will be asked again, does the page of the New Testament warrant it as an infallible definition? Wyclif did not think so, and John Huss, following him, went to the stake just five hundred years ago for defining the Church as the society of the elect.[3] It was the question in regard to which John Wessel said:

> "The church cannot err. But what is the church? It is the communion of the saints to which all true believers belong who are bound by one faith, one hope and one love."

The Dutch churchman did not get that idea from the authorities of his day. He must have gotten it from the New Testament. Otherwise it was an impulse of heretical depravity. But the Augsburg Confession and the Thirty-Nine Articles took his view and reaffirmed it in definitions which are as much like Wessel's as definition could be without using the same language.

It were to be wished that on the front pages of the leaflets above referred to, there might be printed side by side with John 17: 21 the words of Matthew 18: 20: "Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them." The question will emerge at the very outset whether membership in the Church does not depend upon union with Christ even as the branches are united in the vine. In other words, is a person a member of the Church because he believes in Christ, or is he united to Christ and saved because he is a member of the Church? To put it in another way, was Noah in the ark because he was called, or was he called because he

[3] See his famous treatise, *The Church*, trans. with notes (Scribners, 1915).

was in the ark? Our Lord's parable of the marriage supper indicates the answer. And the whole function of the Church will have to be restudied from the page of the New Testament. Is hers the function of a "mother" "conceiving and bringing forth", as Augustine declared centuries ago and Cyprian before him? Cyprian said "no man can have God for his Father who has not before had the church for his mother" (Letter 73: 7). If motherhood is to be ascribed to the Church, then what becomes of all those passages in the New Testament which speak of Christians being begotten or born of the Spirit or of God or of the truth? How can the term "mother" be applied to the Church except in a strictly metaphorical way as Wyclif declared?

The root underneath what I have been saying about the ministry and the Church is whether or not supreme authority lies in the page of the New Testament. The distinction between New Testament Christianity and historical Christianity, as developed after the death of John the Apostle, is bound to be emphasized. Since the Reformation, a clear distinction has been made between a mandate of the New Testament and a teaching or dogma current within the Church. The one is mandatory, the other is at best a matter of expediency in the Christian commonwealth, a thing not of the being but of the best being of the Church. But as the Thirty-Nine Articles, to refer to them once more, clearly state, all teachings and rites are to be tested by the Word of God and no Church has ever existed which might not err. Any other principle than this might lead on easily to the position taken by Pius IX in his declaration of himself as infallible, the dogma "being divinely revealed", and that, in spite of the assurance of possibly the chief expert in Church history then living, Döllinger, that it was never generally held in Christendom.

Another class of facts will also necessarily be brought out by the studies which the Church Unity movement

calls for. The annals of the Protestant Reformation will have to be examined again as also the history of the British and American Churches. It will then appear whether the Fathers of the Anglican Church held that the sacraments are "the chief channels of grace" and whether they rejected as clergymen presbyters non-episcopally ordained. The positions of Hooker, Field and Mason will be re-examined as to the virtue of orders and their number. It will be asked whether the earthly head of the Church in England and parliament did right, in 1749, when they recognized the Moravians as "an ancient Protestant Episcopal Church", and whether Bishop Potter of Pennsylvania was justified in re-ordaining a Moravian minister that he might have "more ample ordination". It should appear how far the provision of the Ordinal is prohibitive of recognizing as a true minister "any minister of any Protestant communion, however great his attainments or holy his life, or admitting him to the Ministry of the Episcopal Church and allowing him to celebrate the Holy Communion without ordination to the Priesthood at the hands of a Bishop", as Dr. Manning declares it does absolutely prohibit. If this be true and episcopal ordination be alone valid, then names must be erased from the list of the Christian ministry such as our own Jonathan Edwards and Richard S. Storrs and Bishop Simpson, Adoniram Judson of Burmah and Henry H. Jessup of Syria. At the same time, Dr. Manning affirms[4] that "a priest of the Roman Catholic Church, of the Holy Orthodox Eastern Church or any other Catholic Communion coming into the fold" of the Protestant Episcopal Church needs not to be ordained. Certainly, no harm can come from such studies seeking in the first place the teaching of the New Testament, and in the second, the dogmatic teachings and practices prevalent in the Church since the death of the last of the Apostles. On the contrary, only

[4] "The Protestant Episcopal Church and Christian Unity", in CONSTRUCTIVE QUARTERLY, December, 1915.

good should come, for the spirit animating the study is not polemical. It is a quest after the truth in order that all who profess and call themselves Christians may be brought into closer fellowship for a witness to the world and the advancement of the kingdom of God.

It is true that, if we confine ourselves to Dr. Manning's article, from which I have just quoted, and to some recent utterances coming from high quarters in the Church of England, there does not seem to be much ultimate promise for Church Unity unless the non-Episcopalian communions are willing to throw overboard and forget principles they have been deeming of grave importance. To refer to three recent formal utterances coming from the pale of the Church of England:—

In his last book, just published and entitled *The Holy Catholic Church*, the late Dr. Swete takes the high ground that the Anglican, Eastern and Roman Catholic Churches constitute the Church. To use his own words, these communions are "the organized army of Christ with regularly appointed commanders, its members conscious of the honour and joy of serving in the ranks of a trained and disciplined force". On the other hand, of the Christians found outside this army he speaks "as irresponsible adventurers, brave and loyal in heart, but members of an irregular army which follows no leaders but such as are chosen by itself". And he also expresses the opinion (p. 84) that "in the famous quadrilateral, the bishops have stated clearly and frankly the minimum which non-Episcopal bodies will be asked to accept, if at any time they are led to desire federation with the historical church". Any words spoken by the author of the much esteemed volume on the work of the Holy Spirit will be treated with respect.

Equally disturbing is the statement made in a recent address by the Bishop of Winchester with reference to the Kikuyu controversy:

"I cannot, without irreverence, receive the sacrament from the hands of a minister who is not ordained according to what Catholic witness bids me believe to be the due order and succession through men at each stage appointed to ordain."

This, of course, is in the line of Bishop Gore's statement that there can be no valid sacrament without bishops in the line of Apostolic succession.

But most disturbing is the attitude of the Anglican bishops, as shown in the case of most of them, in their attitude to the disestablishment of the Church in Wales and, as a whole, in their decision on the Kikuyu case. The latter decision, pronounced in the midst of a war when, as we would have supposed, all would be done that it is possible to do to unite all Christians of the British Empire together, takes what seems to be the strongest ground in unchurching all the non-Episcopalian bodies of the English-speaking world. The Archbishop of Canterbury, after affirming that the threefold ministry has come down to the Anglican Church from Apostolic times, states three principles: (1) An Anglican bishop may permit a non-Episcopal minister to make an address in a given Anglican Church but he dare not permit him to assist in the administration of the sacrament. (2) In cases where the bishop gives specific permission, an Anglican priest may give the communion to a non-Episcopalian. (3) Anglican communicants are forbidden to take the communion from a minister not Episcopally ordained, no exception being allowed even when the communicant is beyond reach of an Anglican church.[5] These principles are set forth, so the archbishop continues, in view of the danger of "making the threefold ministry appear trifling or negligible" and the danger of "doing irreparable ill to the future life of the Church of Christ in that region of the earth"—Africa.

Such utterances are not only disturbing, in view of the

[5] See the full text of the archbishop's decision together with documents in *Kikuyu, the Archbishop of Canterbury, Easter, 1915*—(Macmillans, 1915).

zeal the Primate of all England and Dr. Manning have shown in the cause of Church Unity, but they are to non-Episcopalian students of church history and expositors of the New Testament puzzling.

However, when all this has been said, the facts still stand facing us; namely, the strong impulse towards Church Unity, felt in English-speaking Christendom, the emphasis laid upon our Lord's prayer that his disciples might be one, and the advantages likely to accrue through Church Unity in spreading Christ's kingdom at home and abroad. These facts justify the Church Unity movement and demand that the participation in it be hearty and prayerful, with a willingness to set aside "honest" convictions, if necessary, in the interest of the cause involved.

In this article, no attempt has been made to define the meaning of the expression "Church Unity". Such a definition is not asked and it would be premature. It will emerge as the Church Unity movement progresses. The House of Bishops, in its action of 1886, declared that absorption was not the purpose in mind. The Lambeth Conference of 1908 urged that the "constant desire be not compromise but comprehension, not uniformity but unity". To be sure, Dr. Manning, in the article above quoted, and some of the leaflets speak of "a closer ecclesiastical reunion" of "organic unity" and "outward and visible reunion of all who confess the Lord Jesus Christ as God and Saviour". These are, however, not official and binding statements. The thing proposed is a World Conference on Church Unity and a serious and honest consideration of the general subject, including a discussion of three major topics—the Church, the sacraments, and the ministry. It must also be noted that the Congregational Council of 1913 speaks of a "dynamic unity of the Churches of Christ", and the Presbyterian General Assembly "of mutual recognition and reciprocity". Whatever the goal reached may be, it behoves the Churches

to cultivate the disposition which Dr. Philip Schaff, in his last written words on the Reunion of Christendom, commended when he pronounced a lengthy eulogy upon the Greek and Latin Churches and upon each of the groups of Protestant communions, denominating each of them "a glorious Church". Such a disposition will indeed develop and increase fellowship. It will find in all Protestant bodies devotion to Christ as God and Saviour and, if the test of faithfulness be applied that "by their fruits ye shall know them", each will point to the other rather than to itself. After all, what is the surest criterion of a Christian profession must be the chief condition of church recognition. The Church in Philemon's house, the Churches of Asia and the Church of God in Corinth seem to have had as their condition of membership faith in Christ and a life consistent therewith. The African baptismal formulary to which Cyprian refers (Letters 75: 7): *credis in vitam eternam et remissionem peccatorum per sanctam ecclesiam*—dost thou believe in the life eternal and the remission of sins through the holy Church—must not be allowed to add any new element to the condition stated in the Apostle's words: "through the Son we both have our access in one Spirit unto the Father".

The War, Revival and Reunion

By W. B. Selbie, M.A., D.D.

Since the beginning of the war there has been not a little speculation in Great Britain as to the effect it will be likely to produce on the Christian Churches and the religion they represent. Some of this speculation has been altogether unprofitable, and many of the most confident predictions arising out of it have already been falsified. Those who have a concern for religion are conscious that their expectations of a revival have been sadly disappointed, and are looking forward to the future with almost as much dread as hope. In Great Britain, at any rate, the signs of the times are not very encouraging from the spiritual point of view. The nation is absorbed in the great task which confronts it. Only at the long last has it awakened to its terrible nature, and realized that it is not to be accomplished by merely muddling through. Even now the sacrifices, which it will surely entail, are not fully realized. Many parts of the country are enjoying extraordinary prosperity. Wages are high, there is employment for everyone who wants it, and some people are even making great fortunes. No doubt prices have gone up also, and there is an unwonted scarcity of certain commodities, but as yet these things have caused no real hardship except among the people with small fixed incomes, and they are inarticulate and suffer in silence. Even the great multitude of those who have lost their kith and kin, and the presence of maimed men in every town, have not appreciably affected the religious situation. Were it not for the Zeppelins the war would have remained to most people a rather remote affair.

But the Zeppelins have brought it home, and have certainly succeeded in waking people up to a new determination and intensifying their bitterness against all things German. At the same time, this firmer and more united front has not meant the abandonment of the old party feelings and shibboleths. They are suppressed for the moment but they are only smouldering; and they break out now and then in very ugly fashion. On the part of those who feel sectarian differences most strongly there is no new desire for accommodation. They seem content to go on their old divisive ways, and even to snatch some advantage for themselves and their cause from the nations' plight. All this does not provide a very favourable atmosphere for spiritual development; and the Churches seem so far conscious of it that they can do little more than mark time. On the whole they have not yet suffered through the war as seriously as it was at one time feared they would, and they have risen nobly to many of the new demands made upon them. Their work for the soldiers, and for Belgians, has been beyond all praise, and has only been limited by their capacity. At the same time, they have continued most of their ordinary activities in spite of depleted numbers and fast emptying treasuries.

But with all this there is an uneasy consciousness that things are not well spiritually. It is recognized that the war is raising problems that we are not ready to face. Though the Churches, for the most part, heartily support the war and recognize that, at the time and under the circumstances of its inception, our participation in it was a right thing and the least evil of all the courses then open to us, they have never reconciled themselves to war as, in any sense, Christian. They look forward with horror and dismay to the restoration in Europe of the conditions which seem to make wars inevitable. Face to face with the hopelessness of furthering Christian ideals in a pagan world, they recognize that the task before them is nothing

less than the re-organization of European society from top to bottom. This means, not merely the setting up of new machinery, but the permeation of life with new ideals and the working out of Christian principles in social and international relations. It will require a wider outlook, the substitution of broadly human aims for those which are merely national, the recognition of the obligations of the strong to the weak, and a real spirit of altruism between peoples.

The problem thus opened out is so vast that the Churches may well be forgiven if they shrink from any attempt at solving it as something altogether beyond their powers. Recent events have made them feel their impotence in a rather cruel fashion, and in the weighty discussions now going on as to the inevitable reconstitution after the war, they seem to be regarded as an almost negligible factor. And yet they and they alone have it in them to provide just that which will be indispensable to the new order, *viz.*, the new spirit which alone can make it possible. A recent writer has said,[1]

"Henceforward, if we are to pay our way as a nation, there must be, what England has not known for a century, a real simplicity of life in all classes, and an approximation, if not of incomes, at least of standards of living. If we are to avoid reverting to a struggle between the classes, no less fruitless and even bitterer than before the war, the excesses of both ends of the scale, the luxury at the top and the destitution at the bottom, must be sloughed off by the State. New habits will bring new horizons, as the war has brought to so many already! and England, fortified by a more firmly knit association of all classes of her citizens, may yet lead the way in the solution of the industrial problems with which the civilized world will be everywhere confronted. The 'sophisters and the calculators', the subjects of Burke's everlasting derision, may demonstrate by their statistics that England after the war will be an immeasurably poorer community. The duty rests upon Englishmen to show that her very loss of riches has made her richer in the things that count."

But how is this desirable consummation to be brought about? Not surely by any calculations of expediency, still less by any compulsion of the State. It will only become

[1] In "The Round Table." December, 1915, p. 84.

possible by the birth of a new spirit in the people; by a raising of the national moral. This is admitted now in many circles which are certainly not Christian; and it is for the Christian Churches boldly to proclaim and make good the fact that they alone can supply the motive power needed for the new departure.

It is, we believe, the dim consciousness of this rather than any mere instinct of self-preservation, which is leading the Churches to think much of religious revival in these days. Everywhere there is growing up a "concern" for the state of the Churches which is altogether healthy. It is not as yet very articulate, and it is largely confined to quiet people and to the younger and more earnest among both clergy and laity. It is showing itself in a very real repentance, not for the sins of others, but for those failures in devotion, service, and self-sacrifice which have especially afflicted Christian people. It is driving men and women to a very radical investigation into the causes of past defeats; is throwing them back upon God and upon prayer; and opening their eyes to the dangers of disunion. Many who have never done so before are beginning to see in the Churches a means to an end. To "build Jerusalem in England's green and pleasant land", they regard as something more than a poet's dream, and are prepared to make it the goal of the Churches' endeavours. It is felt that to pray "Thy kingdom come", commits the Churches to action if it is not to condemn them to impotence. The Anglicans, therefore, are preparing for a "National Mission of Repentance and Hope", though not without misgivings; and, at the time of writing, the Free Churches are taking counsel in order that they may do something of the same kind in their own way. There is a general readiness to confess that the world needs Christianity more than anything else, but it must be a Christianity of a somewhat different kind from that which has been offered to it hitherto, something more real, more spiritual, more effective and more brotherly. There

is every reason to expect that these aspirations will be very powerfully supported by many of those who have had direct experience of the horrors of war. Of the men at the front some, no doubt, have been hardened and materialized by what they have gone through. But there is abundant testimony that on others the effect produced has been of a very different kind. They have learned to appreciate the power of the unseen, and they know that it is "not by might nor by power but by God's Spirit", that man truly lives. They have become familiar with danger, terror, and death, and in the presence of these dread realities their whole perspective has been changed. In the days to come, if they are spared, they will certainly not be contented with the easy, humdrum, and reactionary type of religion too often characteristic of the Churches. They will demand something more real and living, and unless the Churches can supply this, their last state will surely be worse than the first. For the sake of these men, therefore, if for no other reason, the Churches at home will need to gird up their loins and trim their lamps that they may be ready for the day of the Lord. It will be necessary to concentrate on the essential things, to abandon futile controversies about order, and property, and ritual and the like, and to fix attention on evangelization and the maintaining of a Christian standard of life and service.

All this will have a very direct bearing on reunion. It brings it at once into the region of practical politics, and shows it to be an absolute necessity. More than this, however, it gives clear indications of the methods by which it may be brought about. Hitherto discussions on the subject have too often taken it for granted that reunion could be attained by some external process and imposed on the Churches as it were from without. No doubt much can be done by such means. It is always good to frame schemes for union especially if they are based on mutual concessions and understanding. Such

work as that of the joint English Committee, which has recently published a most interesting and useful interim report, delimiting the areas of agreement and disagreement, is greatly to be welcomed. But already this report is being criticized as being too theological in tone, and too oblivious of the pressing needs and realities of the present situation. It is argued that agreement must be sought along the deeper lines of spiritual apprehension, and that there may be much unanimity of theological opinion without any real unity of heart. Such a caveat is, no doubt, needed and serves still further to indicate the direction along which all the Churches will need to move. Practically it comes to this that the method must be one of fusion rather than of agglomeration. Reunion would receive an immense impetus from a real revival, and without it, will always remain incomplete and unsatisfactory. If all the Churches were fired with a new spirit, were roused to a genuine devotion to their Lord, and were filled with a passion for His service, they would find themselves welded together by indissoluble bonds. A common interest, a common zeal and a common service would make them one in action and ambition, in spite of all their external variety. And it is surely this kind of living union which is most worth striving for. History has shown clearly enough that uniformity is not union. There must be something more radical, more intimate, before union can be real—a common aim and a common devotion. This, indeed, becomes more possible when there is a large measure of intellectual agreement, but that alone will not create it. At the present time a challenge is being thrown out to the Churches which ought to drive them together, and convince them that united action, at least, is an absolute necessity.

It is one of the commonplaces of the discussion on union that Christians of the most diverse kinds can and do sing the same hymns and sing them sincerely. This only means that there is already a union of hearts on which we

can begin to build. The ultimate Christian experiences of repentance towards God, forgiveness, and faith towards our Lord Jesus Christ are the same for all, however different the terms in which they are expressed, or the channels through which they have come. Now in any revival of religion these experiences must come to the front and take on a new reality. It matters not in what kind of Church it takes place, if it is a genuine religious renewal it will express itself in experiences, certain features of which will be always and everywhere the same. The subjects of these experiences will be one flock, whether they know it or not. They might talk together of the things they had tasted and seen and they would find that, allowing for variations in temperament, they could understand one another and make use of identical terms. If, therefore, such a revival were to make itself felt in all the Churches it would provide, at once, a means towards a better understanding and ought to be used as such. The more deep and sincere is our religious experience, and the keener our passion for the service of God and man, the more ready are we to work alongside of all those who have the same ends in view, and the more impatient do we become of all formal and traditional hindrances to such action. Given the fire of a genuine religious zeal and there are no barriers of sect that can withstand it. Once the Churches have learnt to put first things first and to care for the spiritual needs of men and women and the preaching of the gospel more than for their own maintenance and status, they will be drawn together in spite of themselves. The process will be hastened after the war by the necessity of confronting the huge social and moral ruin which the war brings in its train. Just as the allied nations have been made one in the face of their common enemy, so the Churches will have to attain to a unity amid variety, if they are to make any impression on their common foes.

This means that revival must bring with it a wider

vision as well as a more intense and real religious life if it is to lead to more effective, because united, action. The Churches have shared in the decadence due to the softness of the times. Years of peace and prosperity have dimmed the clearness of their sight and taken the note of urgency from their message. It needed some explosive force to shake them from the ruts of tradition and inertia into which they had fallen. The explosion has come, and the great question is as to whether it is to be suffered to do its work. When the war is over there will be a real danger of reaction, and it is not too soon to begin preparations against it. The best way so to prepare will be for the Churches to take up aggressive work and come to the help of the Lord against the mighty. There is no doubt that they are now growingly alive to the critical position in which they stand. It is indeed a parting of the ways, and everything depends on the extent to which they are prepared to break with their past and set themselves free to meet the new and strange conditions which will obtain after the war. These conditions will not be altogether hostile. Indeed there will be very much in them that will pave the way for a more real religion, and for closer union. An Anglican chaplain to the forces wrote recently:[2]

"The war will prove a mighty Catholicizing factor. Never since the Crusades have the East and West, Latin and Greek, Catholic and heretic been so jumbled and intermingled. The West Country yeoman follows his squire's son to Thessalonica. The London tradesman battles his way through the home-country of Abraham. Hindus are tended in Western hospitals by Japanese nurses, and the influx of Anzacs and Canadians recalls to us the stuff that the ancient missionaries had to convert in the days of Aidan and Penda. For the half-dozenth time in history we have received Flemish refugees. What will be the use of stay-at-home ministers preaching fiery missionary sermons in Tooting, when the men in the pews may themselves have visited India with the Territorials? Balham will have found its way to Basra. Bristol mechanics will have actually fought (and admired) Mohammedans in Egypt and Gallipoli. Protestants from Devon and Yorkshire will have observed Belgian and French Romanism in working for themselves, and will have formed their own conclusions. Whatever extremists may indignantly assert, interdenominational

[2] Rev. A. C. Boquet, in "The Challenge", March 3.

barriers *are* being blurred and obliterated. The clergy may forget all this. The laity will not."

The attitude of the laity may well prove the turning-point in the situation. Revival must begin in the Churches themselves and among those whose religion has been hitherto more nominal than real. Nothing more wonderful has been seen in our time than the splendid voluntary response of the young manhood of the British Empire to the call for military service. It has been called forth by a passion for public right and for liberty. Ultimately it has meant the service of an ideal, and it has been made at a tremendous cost. It has thus revealed a spirit of self-sacrifice that is genuinely religious. Now there are here latent forces which the Churches may have at their disposal for the asking. But they must ask in the right way. For a long time past there has been little or nothing of the heroic in the appeal which the Churches have made. It is not without significance that it should have become easier to obtain the best type of young man and woman for the mission field than for the home ministry. That is because the home Churches do not seem to offer scope for the highest talents and the noblest ambitions. To many ardent souls their work has seemed humdrum and hidebound, with no adventure in it, and little scope for originality. All this must and will change. The time is coming when Christianity will be put on its trial. It must become aggressive and evangelistic, must leave its "walled around" churches and go out into the highways and hedges, compelling men and women to come in. Already it has to defend itself against a world sunk in materialism and selfishness, and in the near future the need to do so will be more urgent. In all this there is a call for the best kind of talent, for self-sacrifice, strategy, consecration and concentration. We look confidently to the young men of our Churches who have so nobly responded to the call of Caesar, and we are sure that they will not turn a deaf ear to the greater call of God.

The Church and the Choir

By the Very Rev. Leonid Turkevich,
Dean of St. Nicholas' Cathedral, New York.[1]

The Editor gives me now a chance to record on the pages of The Constructive, much beloved by me and eagerly propagandized in Russia, the attitude and views of the Orthodox Greek Eastern Church concerning Church Music. I confess I think it a very great honour; indeed, is it not a daring enterprise to speak, in a way, on behalf of a huge branch of the Church of Christ and, what is more, on a matter of principle? On the other hand, though the customs and rules, problems and objects in themselves have become an ancient heritage of our Church, we who call ourselves Orthodox are not in any great habit of theorizing about or of merely discussing them. In the words of Macarios the Great, later generations of Christians will be essentially different from the earlier in this, that the earlier knew what was necessary for the salvation of their souls, and acted accordingly without cavilling, while the later generations, nearer to the end of the world and the Second Advent, though knowing still better what is necessary for their salvation, will lack the impetus to realize what they think necessary. It would seem to me that, as far as I am concerned, my chances to be among the latter are only the greater because I have to synthesize and give expression exactly to that which was practically worked out and transmitted for our use by the former.

Yet in the present invitation of the Editor there is a certain feature which urges me *volens nolens* to take up

[1] Translated by Vera Johnston.

my pen and try to do justice to a thing which briefly can be called The Church and the Choir. What, then, is this feature? It is that in spite of the great variety of the articles and the difference in nationality and views of the authors in this magazine, the Editor has already succeeded in sounding one beautiful sonorous and harmonious chord of many notes to the greater glory of God. The harmonizing of many elements, the bringing of parts which are different into accord with each other, the guiding of the singers, so that the lines of one group became a support, a continuation and an amplification for all the other groups, resolving the whole in a complete harmony—is not all this a purely musical problem? It is brought to my mind how majestic was the singing of the victorious hymn by those of "every nation and clime and country, who, having come victorious from the beast and from his image and from the number of his name, standing by the glassy sea, having harps of gold, sing the song of Moses, the servant of God, and the song of the Lamb, saying: Great and marvellous are thy works, O Lord God Almighty" (Rev. 15: 2–4). And it is not to be wondered at that, as the result of such harmonious confession of truth and unanimous participation in singing the praise of the Lord God the Almighty, "the temple of the tabernacle of the testimony in heaven was opened" (Rev. 15: 5) and new revelation was given of the wonderful manifestations of God's providence concerning the world, until once more the glory of God became the gift to the temple.

The Orthodox Greek Eastern Church allows no instrumental music in its services. This is one of its oldest legacies and customs. It orders its children to praise the Lord by means of the music of human voices, by means of "intelligent" singing. In the words of the great Apostle: "Let the word of Christ dwell in you richly in all wisdom; teaching and admonishing one another with psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, sing-

ing with grace in your hearts unto God" (Col. 3: 15). "I will sing with the spirit and I will sing with the understanding also" (I Cor. 2: 15). Accordingly our Church endeavours that everything, psalms included, should be for the common profit and mutual edification (Rom. 14: 19), that even "he who occupies the room of the unlearned", the uneducated, should be able to receive edification and to say "Amen" when the whole assembly gives thanks, sings and prophesies (I Cor. 14: 16, 17).

Let no one take it amiss in any way if I quote Nicholas V. Gogol who perhaps accidentally but in a highly artistic way described the effect instrumental music made on an Orthodox man:

"At this instant the majestic roar of the organ suddenly filled the whole church. It grew stronger and stronger. It spread, it changed into heavy thundering, and then as suddenly reducing itself into a heavenly music, it soared high under the vault, tender tones sounding like singing girlish voices. Then once more it turned into voluminous roaring and thunder, and then all was silence. The thunder rolled on for a long time, vibrating under the vault, and Andrew wondered with open mouth at the majestic music." [2]

That's it exactly: wonder, even depression, caused by something one's soul cannot contain, even fright and humiliation, are created in men of our nation by these mighty thundering, by these tender and appealing chords of mechanism-made music. It would seem that it was not one soul speaking to another, not one individual appealing to another, but some all-embracing dispassionate impersonal nature manifesting itself, allowing human beings to behold it, although it still remains far above the insignificant, the puny human life. In a way the impression made on a human being by the music of the organ or any instrumental music makes him go through the whole gradation of feelings recorded for us on the eternal pages of the Old Testament:

"And he said, Go forth and stand upon the mount before the Lord. And behold the Lord passed by, and a great and strong wind

[2] *Taras Bulba*, chap. 6

rent the mountains and brake in pieces the rocks before the Lord; but the Lord was not in the wind: and after the wind an earthquake; but the Lord was not in the earthquake: and after the earthquake a fire; but the Lord was not in the fire: and after the fire a still small voice. And it was so when Elijah heard it that he wrapped his face in his mantle and went out and stood in the entering of the cave" (III Kings 11: 19).

When listening to *Dies Irae* or the *Requiem* of Mozart our thought of itself turns to the above quotation. But whether it is like threatening thunder or charming in its gentleness, for this reason the very sound of this music is overpowering, so that it would seem that we are moved to ecstasy, gentle tears, repentance, torture, hope, and faith by some exterior power, almost by violence. In modern operatic music these all-powerful inexorable harmonies work like the stabs of a sword on quivering hearts, so that we stand comatose or prostrate ourselves in an attempt not to be any more, to disappear into nothingness. The words of St. Paul sound so true when he spoke to the Corinthians concerning their almost unconscious visits to idols for all their high culture, all their pride of refinement: "Ye know that ye were Gentiles carried away unto these dumb idols even as ye were led" (I Cor. 12: 2). This kind of being led is not admissible, even in its purest and most spiritualized and exalted form, when their church is concerned, in the opinion of the Christians of the Eastern Greek Catholic Church.

In the painting of its icons the Eastern Church avoids any too palpable naturalism. We shrink from the plastic imagery of our Lord's passion, for instance, admitting sculptured images only to a very limited degree. Similarly our Church legalizes in its music only certain means of drawing man to God and a salutary faith in Christ. These means are purely human (Hosea 11: 4), peaceful, caressing, tentative and cautious, but never oppressive to the soul's liberty or self-consciousness (Isaiah 56: 7).

Some thirty years ago a young poet died in Russia—

people said of tuberculosis, or was it, rather, that he was consumed by the fiery intensity of his inner life? With a Jewish father and a Russian mother, Sergius Nadson's emotional nature was so tense that it did not seem as if he could have survived in the common surroundings of common life. Upon his death he left some beautiful verses, greatly loved by the youth of Russia to this day. Here are a few lines of his which bear rather directly upon our subject:

"It is not Him I pray whom hardly dares my soul
To name, confused and wondering.
To understand or grasp whom a barren quest it were
Which silences and terrifies my mind;
Before whom stand I speechless, with sealed lips—
As naught I feel before Him.

"But there's another Presence, another who draws me.
He has no kingly splendour, but scourge and cross.
Mine is the God of sufferers, of bleeding wounds—
God-Man, God-Brother who comes to me from Heaven.
Before His pain and his triumphant love
I bow my head and fervent is my prayer."

Another aspect of the same subject is well expressed by one more Russian poet, I mean the Grand Duke Constantine, second cousin of the present Emperor, a man of much achievement and culture. His highly polished rhythmic verses, singing of the beautiful and plastic side of Nature, found lasting favour in a broadcast way among all sorts and conditions of Russians. With all that, there was a much more serious side to his intellect and his religious nature. This is attested by the fact that in addition to his military duties he carried out for many years the obligations of the Chairman of the Academy of Sciences in Petrograd. He died at the beginning of the summer of 1915 of heart disease which took an acute form because of the many sorrows which the war brought to his family and to his country.

"Oh, no! I can't believe that to the other side the tomb
We carry no memories of life,
That death, ending forever sorrow and suffering
Will make us sleep the inert sleep of forgetfulness.

"Re-opened somewhere there beyond, shall our eyes be blinded,
And our ears forever cease to hear?
Is our freed mind ne'er to preserve in the dark night beyond the grave
The memories of what once used to be?

"Becoming conscious in the other world, can it be
Raphael forgot the Sistine?
Can it be Shakespeare did not remember Hamlet,
Or that Mozart ceased to love his Requiem?

"It cannot be, no! no! All that is holy, beautiful,
We shall live again, having said good-bye to life.
Oh, no! we shan't forget, but in a purer passionless way
We shall love again, blending with God."

This poem, written in the anguish of doubting whether any works of human genius, in colour, in marble, or in sound, can penetrate the brighter life beyond the grave, indicates in a lyrical and plastic way a sensation with which every introspective writer is familiar. Once more it makes clear that the soul of an Orthodox Russian fears to imprison his thought, his feeling, or his consciousness within the limits of rigid forms, which, for all that they are lifeless, are still too plastic, too beautifully finished wholly to satisfy his craving. Russian longing can be satisfied not by the finished in art but by the sense of accessibility, the sense of ever growing nearer to that which is completed, which remains for ever and is therefore endless and eternally serene.

By saying all this we doubtlessly transgress into the region of faith, the mood of expectancy which transforms for us the Nicene Creed into a majestic melody that ever calls forth admiration but never satiety. This melody we sing, for in the words of St. Paul (Heb. 13: 14): "Here have we no continuing city, but we seek the city which is to come." In spite of the opinion of Professor M. Tareeff, a very profound and ponderous theologian, that no poetry is to be sought for in an abstract building up of dogmas in which every line, every word, is an idea appealing to the mind but by no means able to affect any human feeling in any direct way, the Creed to us is the best of melodies, the supreme realization of faith vic-

torious over unbelief, of truth over deceit, of hope over the despair and depression coming from the vanities of life close around us (I John 5: 19).

Then what is it we look for in the real? What is it that we are always willing to listen to in music? It is the continuity of life that we treasure in both. We have life in order that it should continue to be alive. The victory of life over death, this is our lasting, our undying joy, our joy that cannot die. "Christ has risen." In this short announcement there is so much joy, serenity, radiance and light, so much spiritual sun, that we repeat it countlessly, millions of times with the same strength, the same enthusiasm and gladness. "It's the Day of Resurrection. Let us be brighter, oh men! Easter, it is the Lord's Easter! From death to life and from earth to heaven Christ-God has led us. So let us sing victoriously" (Irmos of the First Song of the Paschal Canon). The singing of this chant is closely associated for us with the first fresh breeze of spring, the first songs of birds, the new abundance of sunlight, the tender green of the trees and the grass, new space around us, new heights and new depths. But none of these are as effective in making us spiritually glad as the song which with a joyous daring we sing at the end of the Paschal Canon: "O the greatest, the most holy Passover! Thou who art Christ, the Wisdom, the Word of God, and the Power! Grant to us to partake of Thee in a truer way in the Day of Thy Kingdom, the Day which hath no evening" (Ninth Song of the same Paschal Canon). The joy we have in this song, announcing to us the coming of the endless dwelling with the most gentle Jesus, is so great that before it darken even such songs as "Many Years", in which we wish long life to those whom we honour and love. Such a wish of long life, is it not merely a condition which enables us better to confirm ourselves in the hope of our future endless dwelling with our Lord Jesus in the life to come (I Thes. 4: 17)?

That this is a correct interpretation is proved by the willingness with which we listen to another song on the same subject of life eternal, a song which we sing solemnly and gravely, in which we wish "eternal memory" to our dead. Everything passes, everything that is shallow, that is superficial, earthly, vain, commonplace or insignificant. For our life beyond the tomb nothing remains but that which is deathless. But with whom does it remain? Whither does it go? Where does it rest after its heavy labours? With Him Who alone is All-Merciful (Rev. 14: 13). Let Him receive them who have died in the Lord as He received them when they still lived on earth before Him, "for whether we live, we live unto the Lord; and whether we die, we die unto the Lord: whether we live, therefore, or die, we are the Lord's" (Rom. 14: 8). Lord God, grant to those who have passed away "eternal memory" in His light!

The great value of church singing is exactly in this, that it relieves man's soul from the oppression of sorrow. When it is perfectly intelligible it easily affords an escape to the scum life deposits in our hearts. Evil is inevitable, though the soul shuns it. Small cares that our bodies should be comfortable have too much power over us, and the spirit of man is weighed down by them. "Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God" (Matt. 4: 4). And lo! an harmonious chord is sounded, intelligible to us. Our souls hear "the word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God." Our daring increases, our hope revives, the wished-for escape from a condition of depression is found. Impenetrable gloom spreads over our past—yet "Open the doors of repentance to me, O Life-Giver" (Prayer sung during Lent). Mean was the condition into which we had fallen—"Yet Thou, O Lord, be generous to me" (Penitential Canon of St. Andrew of Crete).

The weapons of logical reasoning or of the most eloquent words, do not touch sides of our spiritual nature

which need a breaking away, an impetus towards motion and a change. In the words of Alexander Pushkin: "But at the lightest touch of the divine word on my sensitive hearing, my soul will shudder and soar up like a frightened eagle."

It is often pointed out to us that our Russian music is too sad. That sadness is also preponderant in the singing of the Eastern Church. And indeed in the Orthodox Church there are almost twice as many chants of sorrow and repentance as chants of joy. It is true that it is a great satisfaction for us to listen to the chants of the Passion Week and especially those of Holy Friday. They are sung in the so-called Bulgarian mode, though it would be more accurate to say the Servian. These chants are: "To Thee Who art clad with light as with a garment", "The fair Joseph", "Come, let us glorify Joseph the ever-to-be-remembered", and others. The daring rapidity of the changing moods in the chants touch our emotions, moving us to pity or to joy, and reconciling us. It would seem that in these chants piety entered in perfect blend. It is true they are sorrowful, yet this sorrow is not of oppression but of regret that we are still so far from the ideal, from holiness and divinity. The consciousness of our sinfulness blends with the longing to become one with our Saviour, suffering now for us. Yet the whole of reconciliation has been granted to us, and so the final chord sounds solemn and triumphant. Needless to say that Slavonic psychology has to a considerable degree affected vocal music in the Eastern Church. The Orthodox Church has never at any time suppressed national differences. All that was asked was that the spiritual idea of this or that community, or of a whole nation, should be truly exalted. Under this condition only, any composition of any artist may be admitted into the cycle of chants accepted by the Church. This is why, having mentioned the Bulgarian, or rather ancient Servian chants, we must men-

tion the Greek. The Orthodox Church uses these latter chants throughout all the divine services of Easter. Their simplicity, their easy grace and rhythm charm the listeners. So light, joyous and lively are the recitatives that the ear assimilates them without any difficulty whatever. In the Greek chants the joyous chords, lightly hurrying forward, remind the listeners of a bright blue sea and the incessant motion of its waves.

Side by side with these stand local chants, among which the chant of Kieff occupies the first place in the prayers for the dead, the services and liturgy of Lent. He who has heard the "Blessed art Thou, O Lord, teach me thy statutes" of the mortuary service, or "The Bridegroom cometh at midnight", has certainly realized both the anguish of a soul which has wandered away from its divine Shepherd and the relief of a tired swimmer who has at last entered the haven. Another local chant is called after an unknown singer whose name was Hierasimos. The Ambrosian hymn, "We praise thee O Lord", and others, belong to that class of chanting. We may also mention the Ipatieff chant and that of the Lavra of Kieff, called after the monasteries which use them.

But the predominant character of chanting is the famous eight-part singing which was introduced by St. John Damascene in the ninth century. It is in general use throughout all the Orthodox and even the non-Orthodox East. The regular uniformity and the resolving of the many melodies to the definite eight is borrowed from the music of ancient Greece. This would almost seem to be the dogmatical part of singing in the Orthodox Church. The whole order of its divine services rests on these chants, which are generally rhythmical and simple. At times they are strong and broad as in the first chant, or vigilant as in the eighth. They are tender and beseeching as in the second or the fifth. The ancient Doric, Ionic, Phrygian and Lydian melo-

dies with their derivatives are distributed according to voices, so that the first voice corresponds to the fifth, the second to the sixth, the third to the seventh, and the fourth to the eighth. The confident simplicity of the third corresponds to the gentle softness and music of the seventh. The calm gravity of the melodies of the fourth voice is supported by the alertness and sweetness of the eighth. Then the sixth is more direct and the more soul-reaching.

The Greeks in working out the patterns of church singing reached the highest point of their musical genius. But the Slavonic nature could not be limited by this norm altogether. Perhaps in no respect does there exist a more graphic instance of the difference between the Slavonic spirit and the Greek, the Byzantine, than precisely in church singing. The Greeks like complete unison, but the Slavs admit singing second and also the harmonious singing of many voices. The former give us regularly alternating rhythms. With the latter, lack of symmetry is predominant. Of course unity is preserved in Russian Church music, but this unity admits of so much diversity in details that it will be preserved only in the fundamental tones. To illustrate my idea in architecture, let me mention the Cathedral of St. Basil the Blissful in Moscow; and in music, the arrangement of the Kieff chant, "Glory be to God on High". Consequently the Russian Church is continually creative in its music, whereas it would seem that the creativeness of the Greek Church in that region is never heard of.

Creativeness is not only allowed by our Church, but encouraged. At present we have a great number of fine church composers. The Holy Synod monthly examines and approves for use in church choirs scores of musical works. We have only to name Rimsky-Korsakoff, Archangelsky, Kastalsky, Fateef, and others, to demonstrate the breadth of view of the Russian Church in the use of new compositions.

However, we should mention that not every one of these new religious compositions can be accepted for general church use. Some of the composers are far too subjective to be able to express the essence of the faith of the people to whose community they belong. The Orthodox people highly appreciate the religious compositions of P. I. Tschaikovsky. The music he wrote, in 1879, for the liturgy of St. John Chrysostom, though forbidden for the use of churches, was sung everywhere as soon as it was published by many choirs, beginning with the Imperial Capella. His music for the all night vigil, in which the famous Russian composer experimented with the harmonization of ancient melodies, is also very important. Anton Rubinstein can be numbered among religious composers though he hardly ever touched church music. His "Moses", "Christ", "Paradise Lost", and "The Tower of Babel" could not possibly be included among the habitual chants of the Orthodox people. The example of these two greatest Russian composers clearly demonstrates that only those compositions in which the Russian people recognizes the expression of its belief and its ideal, the invisible ideal dwelling in the collective consciousness of the Orthodox Church,—a perfectly objective expression which finds a simile in the Orthodox icon—can become the property of the people indivisibly and for all time.

Here is a pretty illustration of what I have tried to say above. In 1911, the Choral Society of Pskoff gave a musical celebration in their town. The festival continued for two days. A huge choir composed of a great number of village choirs sung first; then separate choirs began to sing. There was a very large audience, but it seemed that every one missed something, though the programme in its secular part was both serious and very carefully composed of pieces belonging to operatic music, and in its ecclesiastical part contained many complicated and difficult works. Then there came on the platform

the choir from the village of Chirki. They walked hesitatingly. They did not know enough to stand in a semi-circle. They just crowded one against the other like a flock of astonished sheep; frank grey and blue eyes, sunburnt faces, flanked by the choirmaster, the village school teacher. This choir sang only the very simple pieces accessible for any choir: "I open my lips and announce Thy glory" to an ancient tune of their city. And the listeners were actually moved to tears. With the thin trebles of small boys and only two or three tenors and basses, the singing was hardly audible, but silence reigned complete; ten thousand human beings crowded together stood motionless and noiseless. It was the vibrating, almost conscious silence that made men aware that every one felt the inspiration, that they were at one with the choir in its true art. The singing brought images of poor parish churches which each of the listeners had known and loved, memories of their past prayers. People recognized in this singing religion; not a consciously assumed transitory mood, but an even and bright burning of the spirit before God. People listened delightedly when this choir sang, their voices penetrated with true faith, such chants as "And I shall appear luminously triumphant and shall sing in my joy her [the Virgin's] miracles." And so the small choir of a poor country parish gained everyone's attention, everyone's delighted appreciation. It sang many times later, and every time with the same result.

This certainly demonstrates that the true nature of religious singing expected and demanded by the Orthodox people must be strictly objective, well able to afford free soaring to their prayerful mood. First of all, it is necessary that such singing evoke in the listeners the desire to praise God, to bow down before His greatness, that the soul should long to soar into sacred regions which it fervently desired to reach yet could not. It is necessary that such singing, even if it be deprived of

majesty or any great art, should be the expression of the collective feeling of the whole Church, that it should be at one with the beliefs and sympathies of the people for whom it is designed. It is necessary that it should be the outcome of communion of faith, the result of contact with other souls moved by the same religious consciousness, that it should give us that which is our own, shared with all our kindred, but at the same time shared by all humanity—that it should be universal. Only then will church singing be able to affect our souls, pouring into them faith, hope and charity, peace, trust and light.

Even the people who are not Orthodox are impressed exactly in this way by some of the simplest of our prayer tunes, for instance, the habitual Lord's Prayer or "Lord, save Thy people", or "Take me under Thy shelter, Virgin Mother of God", and many others. These religious hymns are as deeply rooted in the Orthodox, occupy as broad a place, as the national hymn "God save the Tsar". When the personal creations of individual composers come near, in their quality, to the widely spread and accessible expressions of the common profound religious consciousness, they easily take their place in the catalogues of choral music and begin to be sung in churches everywhere throughout Russia.

Once such a demand exists, it becomes clear why instrumental music does not satisfy the Orthodox believers. It is far too complicated. It becomes also clear why oratorios and religious operas never become generally approved. They are too subjective and too far-fetched. Incidentally it also becomes clear why it is unimportant whether the church choir has many varied parts or sings in unison, whether the choir has fine octavists and soloists, whether it is a mixed choir, or a choir in which only men and boys sing—all that is really important is that the praise of the Lord God should be intelligent, human, direct and sincere. It also explains why Orthodox Christians are perfectly able to love and treasure

and deem holy even such melodies as were originated by the non-Orthodox West and which have been developed on the subjective foundations of religious creation alien to the Orthodox. If a Western composer has been lifted up by the power of his personal genius to the highest sphere of artistic composition, on reaching which —be it only for a moment—he has ceased to be merely a Western Christian and become just a Christian, the work that has come from him gives a solution of the most exact and superior problems of church music. In the West there exist religious compositions which fill Orthodox Christians with true religious elation, as there are buildings raised by truly believing architects of the West, on entering which the Orthodox will cross themselves as in one of their own churches. Natural precious ties attach Raphael's Madonna to the hearts of the Orthodox, as some of the great mediaeval cathedrals of the West including the demolished cathedral of Rheims are to them most precious and intelligible.

In 1843, Philaretes the Metropolitan of Moscow wrote with regard to a new movement among the painters of the ancient city: "To wishes of good success I join the wish that their art should have a national tendency, and in particular, that painting should tend towards the character of ancient sacred painting. The icon is the beginning and end of Christian painting which insists that art should worthily supply the needs of the Orthodox Church in Russia." This wish of the saintly prelate came to be realized: Vasnetzoff, Nesteroff, and other Russian painters began long ago to use their skill and their inspiration in the region of truly artistic icon painting. By reason of the pure affinity between the arts, in the region of music the church chants have grown to be both the beginning and the supreme end of vocal composition in general.

For this reason the love of Russian church music, the growth of which we see of late in America and in Eng-

land, makes all the truly Orthodox so truly glad. In this appreciation and the desire to learn more of our divine services we see the gage of kinship, even of the unity, of all Christian souls in which the One Christ should reign supreme, on the foundation of our common longing and faith in the continuity of our eternal life beyond the grave.

Appreciation of Another's Faith

By Gilbert Reid, D.D.,
International Institute, Shanghai, China.[1]

I. A Protestant's Appreciation of the Church of Rome

It is a striking fact, an interesting circumstance needing elucidation, that cordial relations between Christians and non-Christians are more feasible sometimes than between Christians and Christians. An appreciation by a Christian of the three great religions of China, Confucianism, Taoism and Buddhism, frequently denominated as "heathen" or pagan faiths, excites but little surprise and is taken to be a conciliatory method of prosecuting Christian missions.

When we consider the relations of the Christian to Islam or to Judaism, the surprising disclosure is made that while Christian, Jew and Moslem all worship the one God and are all intellectually monotheistic, yet the records of the past have been stained by unholy wars, generally called holy, by unrighteous hatreds, generally excused as righteous, and by the spirit of bigotry, intolerance and persecution, generally construed as loyalty to the truth. An explanation is found in the common occurrence that hatred between brothers is more fierce and deep-dyed than between different families. In accordance with

[1]The substance of the two following articles was originally given as lectures at the weekly Conferences of the World's Religions in the International Institute of China, in a series under the appointment of the Billings Lectureship. The lecturer is a Presbyterian clergyman while the Lectureship which appointed him is Unitarian. The general theme of the series is "Appreciation of Another's Faith".

a modern custom in China, these three brothers have long since divided their inheritance and separated most unpleasantly from each other.

When we advance to the relations between Protestants and Roman Catholics, we are struck by the fact that the closer the relationship, the deeper the hatred. Here is what impresses the non-Christian Asiatic, that those who are Christians, or at least the authorized and ordained priests and pastors of the Christian Church, have nothing to do with each other: yea, that they anathematize, excommunicate and denounce each other. "Are they, or are they not, two branches of the one Holy Catholic Church?" this is the question that puzzles the unbaptized. . . .

To see how far we have advanced in the spirit of brotherliness as between Protestant and Roman Catholic, we need only cite the great Missionary Conference held in Edinburgh in 1910 . . . when all mention of missions to Roman Catholic countries was omitted, when a fraternal message was received from a Roman Catholic Bishop, as well as from a Greek Church Bishop, and when the hope was expressed that at the next Conference all branches of the Christian Church might be represented. At that Conference the Rt. Rev. Bishop Brent, who in going to the Philippines determined to carry on no propaganda among Catholic Christians, gave utterance to these sentiments of unity and fraternity:

"There are four things I want to touch upon. Let us treat the Roman Catholics always as Christians, and let us believe that they are true and sincere Christians until it is proved to us that they are otherwise. In Roman Catholic countries especially let us always preach constructive truth and not destructive truth, and show that we do not intend to demolish our neighbours' walls to get stones for our own. In the next place, let us be sure that we get an intelligent grasp of the Roman Catholic faith, polity, and methods before we talk publicly about them, and let us be sure that we do not commit that most grievous of all sins, slandering another Church. Slander is always an evil in any cause, but for one Church to be guilty of slandering another is a double sin in the sight of God."

Ultimate unity between all branches of the Christian Church may never come, but it may be advanced to the

stage where disunion, schism and discord will be regarded as a scandal to those who worship the same God and alike follow the teachings of Jesus the Christ. One way to bring this about is for the Protestant to study how and in what respects he may appreciate the Roman Catholics, or, as Bishop Brent has said, have "an intelligent grasp of the Roman Catholic faith, polity and methods".

(1) The first matter of appreciation is that the Roman Catholic Church, as the Russian or Greek Church, holds with the Protestants to the same cardinal doctrines of Christianity. That there is divergence of belief between these great branches of the Church must be acknowledged, but in how many essential truths do they all see eye to eye! The points of agreement are explained equally well by Eastern and Western Church, and by the many denominations of the Reformed Faith. Whilst possibly the liberal school of thought amongst Protestants might criticize some of the dogmas and polity of the Church of Rome, the Orthodox bodies have reason for being pleased that in main doctrines there is practical agreement. . . . The foundation principle, as of Judaism and Islam, and of the primitive faith of all peoples, is in the words "I believe in God the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth." The orthodox teaching of both Protestants and Catholics concerning man is also in substance the same, namely, the sinfulness of man as derived from the fall of the first man, and the need of a divine Saviour to forgive and redeem. All the great branches of the Christian Church likewise teach the divine-human nature of Jesus Christ, or the doctrine of His immaculate conception and the Incarnation. They agree concerning the doctrines of Atonement and Justification, of Christ's crucifixion, resurrection and ascension, of the presence of the Holy Spirit the Comforter, of regeneration and sanctification, of immortality and the resurrection of the dead, of a Day of Judgment and future retribution, of rewards and punishments, of prayer, worship and deeds of penitence in

this life, and of heavenly bliss in the life beyond. The great Protestant bodies and the Church of Rome recognize the authority of the Scriptures and the organism of the Church with its orders and sacraments, all dependent in some way on Christ and the Apostles. In fact Christianity is one religion, and the groundwork of Calvinistic, Arminian, Lutheran or Anglican theology was laid centuries ago, even before the division of the Eastern and Western Churches.

Christianity, in fact, is one religion, though the Christian Church be divided. The heresies of the early Church —doctrines of a minority—are heresies of Christendom today, whether Greek Church, Church of Rome, or the Protestant Churches—doctrines still of a minority. In all communions there are both conservative and liberal tendencies; the former are the orthordox and of the majority, and they largely agree, whether as seen in the one communion or the other. So Protestant liberalism and Roman Catholic modernism are essentially the same, though the break with the iron-clad formularies of the past is not always at the same point. It would seem that if any division were to take place in Christianity or the Christian organization, it would be between these conservative and liberal tendencies, as in other religious Faiths, rather than in other matters which separate the Protestant and the Roman Catholic. The conservative Protestant and the conservative Roman Catholic are at one in the great doctrines of Christianity, and for either to appreciate the other ought to be easy, as within the bounds of Christian courtesy and intellectual sympathy. So, too, the liberal Protestant and the liberal Roman Catholic should find it possible to work together in the service of humanity.

(2) A second feature of the Church of Rome which every Protestant, and in fact every man, is bound to appreciate is its unparalleled organization. The whole world is mapped out into a complete system. All parts

of the system are unified in the Papacy. The Supreme Pontiff is certainly the greatest ruler on the earth, his sway extending into every country, amongst all races, all alike called his children. He is rightly called in Chinese "the Emperor" of the Religion or of the Church. From him as Holy Father, the system works out in perfect symmetry and gradation, far surpassing the power and orderliness of the Roman Empire in days of the Caesars, down through the Papal Court, the Cardinals, the archbishops, bishops and priests to every humble member of the Church, whatever his colour, class or nationality, going to the same Mass. The Orders of the Church, whether Jesuit or Franciscan, in their own way develop to the highest proficiency the organizing ability of the leaders of the Church. Leaving out for the moment the religious or divine aspects of the Church of Rome, it stands forth amongst all human organizations, all forms of government, all societies or associations, as the most complete and compact, the most universal and efficient organization that the world has ever known. The Holy Father who sits at the Vatican in Rome, whether regarded as Vicar of God or not, commands the homage of more men, clear round the globe, than a Caesar or a Constantine, a Charlemagne or a Napoleon, ever dreamed to be his destiny. The whole vast machinery works, moreover, smoothly. There is now and then friction, but this only shows the need of a little oiling; the machine goes on forever. Even when some part of the machinery is taken away, the power-house is as mighty as ever, the great wheels move round; and the little wheels have all their places, indicative of the master mind that directs all.

Here in China an illustration is afforded of the symmetry of this wonderful church organization. The whole country is divided into a number of dioceses, and in each diocese some one society or order, whether of the Jesuits, Lazarists, Dominicans, or some other, is exclusively at

work. This is the perfection of mission comity. The particular Society is seldom named; all that the Chinese through the length and breadth of the land ever hear of is "the Religion of the Heavenly Lord"—the one Church of Rome.

Not merely the admirers of Presbyterianism, with its well-reasoned system of theology, or of Methodism, whose distinct characteristic is method, or of Episcopacy, with the primacy of the Archbishop of Canterbury, or of the Lutheran Churches on the Continent, with their close relation to the State, can readily see the attraction of the Roman organization, but all who belong to more independent bodies and believe in individualism, must also acknowledge that no religion and no nation has ever produced such a complete and all-embracing system of government as that which through the centuries has been unfolded in the Church of Rome. As one has well said: "The realm over which Augustus Caesar swayed his sceptre was narrow compared with that of his spiritual successor. The encyclical letter which emanates from the Vatican is addressed to one half the civilized world, and binds the consciences of a fourth of the human race."

(3) A third reason why every Protestant should appreciate the Church of Rome is its high ideal concerning the Church of God. What has already been said of the Church of Rome as a great organization concerns aspects human and practical. What is now to be explained concerns divine and idealistic elements. We now deal not so much with the Church of Rome as with the Roman conception of what is called in the early creeds "the Holy Catholic Church".

According to ideas largely prevalent amongst Roman Catholic thinkers, the beginnings of Christianity were centred in the establishment on earth of the Kingdom of God or Heaven. To the Jews this thought imparted enthusiasm and hope, as being the larger realization not only of the Church of God centred on Mount Zion,

but of the longings and desires through many centuries that a Messiah would come to re-establish a Kingdom of God's chosen people.

The message, "The Kingdom of Heaven is at hand", was a germinal thought in the mind of Jesus and of His disciples. In due time the word "Church" supplanted the word "Kingdom", but the thought remained the same. That which existed in heaven was some time to exist over all the earth—allegiance to God as Sovereign and to Jesus Christ His Vicegerent on earth. That which previously existed amongst the people of Israel was now to exist amongst the true Israel, who followed Christ, namely, a society of God's elect, with Jesus as its Head. The power first held by Jesus alone was transmitted to the Apostles, and through them to the Church at large and to the bishops in charge of the souls of men. The Church was the body of the risen Lord; and His divine nature passed over to the Church down to the end of time. There was only "one faith, one hope, one baptism"; there was only one Saviour, one religion, one Church.

The early Church was one, though there were many local churches. It was not long before the Bishop of Rome was recognized as successor of St. Peter, as Vicar of God, as Vicegerent of Christ. Even where this primacy was not accepted, there was no doubt concerning the oneness, the sacredness, the divine character, of the Christian Church. Neither was the Church divided into the visible and invisible: the Church was one, with both visible and invisible, external and internal, characteristics.

It was generally believed that the Church was the living embodiment of Christ. This elevated the Church as a divine organism far above all organizations of human device and human control. Of this there was but little doubt; such dispute as there was, and has continued to be, centred around the degree of power and authority which rested in the Bishop of Rome, later designated as the Pope, and with the great Ecumenical Councils. The

Church of Rome, beyond these particular matters of dispute, has with other Christians laid great stress on the grandeur and significance of the church idea. All the Eastern Churches, and most of the Anglicans, Lutherans and Presbyterians, amongst the Protestants, have been influenced by the same ideal, not of ecclesiasticism, but of God's Kingdom as represented in the Christian Church. To the Roman Catholic this ideal may be blurred by the other thought that only the Church of Rome is the Kingdom of God, and that all others, whilst equally Christian, have withdrawn from the Church and are guilty of schism; but this shadow on the light should not lessen our reverence for the light itself.

"The genius of Catholicism is union and co-operation, a common purpose and common labour for its accomplishment." This unity is the essence of Catholicism, though not always of Romanism. This unity, this Catholicity, is none the less a dominant note in the teachings of the Church of Rome. In the Roman conception of the Church there is also the thought of historical continuity, the Church of today being traced back to Christ who is "the Head over all things to the Church". In the Church the Christian of today is linked with all the saints who have gone before. "The communion of saints" is inseparably joined with a belief in "the holy Catholic Church". In comparison, Protestantism appears as isolation. Even for the one who loves isolation it ought not to be hard to see the attraction of the Roman Catholic conception and to express appreciation.

It is this high idealism, characterizing the Church of Christ, this sacredness, unity, catholicity and continuity, which keeps the modernist movement from leaving the Church of Rome and joining with the liberal element in Protestant Churches. This fact makes clear the reasonableness of the Church of Rome concerning the inner life, the soul, of the Kingdom which Christ inaugurated and of the Universal Church which He came to found.

(4) A fourth attractive feature of the Church of Rome is the repose which it offers for doubt and uncertainty in the acceptance of the Church's authority. John Henry Newman is not the only one who has journeyed to the Church of Rome that he might thereby find peace of mind. As Professor William Adams Brown has said,

> "The joy which sings in the closing chapter of his *Apologia* is not the satisfaction which comes from insight into truth, but the peace which follows the relinquishment of a hopeless quest."

Every one to find peace in his intellectual speculations, in his strivings after truth, in his bewilderment over clashing theories and varied teachers, must at last fall back on what to him is taken as authority. One grows weary of searching; he is satisfied only with something final, decisive and authoritative. The Roman Catholic places authority in the Church, and generally in the Papacy and the Church Councils. Most Protestants have made the Bible their religious authority, "the infallible rule of faith and practice". Some years ago I was delegate to the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church of the United States, when Professor Charles Briggs, my esteemed teacher, was turned out of the ministry for teaching, amongst other heresies, that there were three sources of authority, the Bible, the Church, and the Reason or Christian consciousness. The distinctive liberal element in Protestantism makes one's own reason, or enlightened conscience, or the general Christian consciousness of the best men, the authoritative voice on religious matters. It is the reason that examines the records and text of the Scriptures, that weighs the *dicta* of the Church, and decides what to accept and what to reject. Finally, for nearly all Christians, after disputing with each other over these various forms of authority, there will probably be a consensus that the final word, the authoritative statement, the teaching clear and restful, bringing peace and joy, is the Man Christ Jesus, the Logos of God. Dr. Henry Van Dyke, has well said:

"Christ is the Light of all Scripture. Christ is the Master of holy reason. Christ is the sole Lord and Life of the true Church. By His word we test all doctrines, conclusions, and commands. On His word we build all faith. This is *the* source of authority in the kingdom of heaven."

It is my opinion that in some such statement as this, Protestant, Roman Catholic, Greek Church, Koptic and Armenian, can all draw near each other. The Protestant can agree with the Catholic that the Church possesses authority; and the Catholic can agree with the Protestant that the Bible possesses authority, and both will agree that Christ, or, perhaps we should say God, is the final source of all authority. If the soul, if one's thoughts, if one's aspirations, are left in a state of uncertainty, there can be no peace or repose. Discussions in a nation concerning constitutions are interesting and profitable for a time. Finally the time comes when the nation grows tired of such discussions and demands a definite constitution, however imperfect it may be. So the average Christian, after full play of his independence, craves for some strong word: "This is the way, walk ye in it. This is the truth, accept it."

Authority is something solid on which to build. In the last resort, one can find rest only in God. He speaks with authority; He rules with authority. The Bible, the Church, the Sacraments, one's own reason, are all ways in which God reveals His authoritative word, but behind all is God, and He it is who gives authority to one and all.

(5) The Church of Rome cultivates the spirit and demeanour of reverence. As Miss Frances Cobbe has said, "Religion is reverence." Religion means a right attitude of man towards God. Reverence is this right attitude. As for man there should be respect; for God, reverence. "Honour all men; fear God; honour the King." "The fear of God—reverence for God—is the beginning of wisdom."

In Protestantism, amongst some of its exponents, there is a familiarity in religious expressions, in prayer and in

preaching, in general demeanour in the sanctuary, and in discarding of the term sacred, which makes Christianity appear commonplace, rather than gives it an exalted position in man's affections and worship. The Roman Catholic system trains character of another kind. Its worship is dignified, solemn, stately, inspiring, reverential. Entrance into the church, as the entrance into the Moslem mosque, is in the form, if not always the spirit, of reverence. A reverential demeanour is certainly more conducive to a reverential heart, than is a careless and thoughtless manner. The Catholic approaches the Mass in feelings of awe; the Protestant in too many cases regards the communion-table as of so little importance that he stays away and feels satisfied. With the Catholic, the church, the priest, the sacraments, and even the cemetery, are all sacred, that is, set apart to God. With the Protestant, while nothing is common or unclean, so also nothing is sacred, and all things are the same. The reverential quality of the Church of Rome deserves the admiration and also the imitation of all Protestants. In this the Episcopal service has set an example, retaining that which is so fundamental to the teachings of the ancient Church.

(6) Along with this reverential aspect of the Church of Rome is its cultivation of the devotional spirit. Reverence and worship, prayer and devotion, these are the twin virtues of religion.

Most Protestant churches are closed, except in time of public service; every Roman Catholic church has its doors always unlocked, that the weary and the troubled may enter within, and in the quietness of the sacred place, kneel before the altar, silently repeat the devotional utterances of an established ritual, and amid hallowed surroundings lay open the heart to the presence of the Spirit of God.

The literature of the Roman Catholic Church is rich in books of devotion. Prayers, hymns, meditations, ex-

hortations, and confessions, poured forth from the very depths of the soul, are the treasures left to coming ages by saintly men and women who lived near to God and felt God's thoughts. The books of devotion of a Bernard and an á Kempis, of a St. Theresa and an Assisi, are not for Roman Catholics alone, but for all Christians who feel the need of divine grace and the value of the upward look.

The Roman Catholic Church has many ways for cultivating and satisfying the devotional nature. Quiet places, a retreat, the confessional, a mission, are all meant to help one in his struggle to be better. The Church, with its altar, places one in the right surroundings for being devotional. Whilst escape from the world is impossible for most Christians, there are ways provided for making this escape a reality, even if only for a day or an hour.

(7) Along with this devotional character of the Church of Rome, it cultivates another form of devotion, that of devotion to the needs and sorrows of fellow-men. All through the centuries, and amongst all peoples, and in all nations, there have been those who have denied themselves all that they might serve others. Self-sacrifice stands forth as one charm of the great body of sisters of charity. The meaning of entering the priesthood or a sisterhood is that of giving up all family ties, all personal property, and being set apart for the service of the Church.

The devoted lives of those who thus deny themselves all has ever won the praise of men. Such speak more powerfully than any sermon the essence of Christianity, which is the love of God and the compassion of Christ. As Christ healed the lepers, and turned not from them, so there have been those in the Catholic Church who have not shrunk from the most repulsive diseases and the most perilous situations. In my early school-days I was so attracted to a priest with whom I was travelling, who had just passed through the scourge of the yellow fever in one

of our southern cities, that to this day the impression of his life remains with me.

Such are the ones who have gone forth to preach the Gospel and proclaim the Church to the millions outside the pale, and in doing so they have lived simply, yea, with self-denial and in true devotion to others. The Church of Rome was missionary before any of the Protestant bodies which struggled for existence. In India and China and Japan they were the advanced guard preparing the way for us Protestants.

(8) The Church of Rome has had a genius for adapting itself to all conditions of men. It is stable and stationary in dogma and creed; it may discountenance progressiveness, but it includes within the bosom of the one Church all varieties of Christians, conservative and progressive, theological and socialistic. As priests they may be warned not to go too far, but they are still members of the Church. The very learned and the masses of the ignorant, the aristocracy and the nobility, and the semi-civilized and the poor, all alike meet in the same places of worship, use the same ritual, and hear the same words of absolution.

The Church of Rome has gone round the world and adapted itself to every form of government and to all the varied social usages of different nations of men. All minds, all classes, all races, find something in the Church of Rome to attract them. And the Church knows how to use all; however eccentric one may be, the Church can give him some task to do. This adaptability of the Church of Rome proves that it is part of the Christian Church and has a mission in all the world and to all ages. This quality the Protestant does well to appreciate.

(9) The Church of Rome has also done much for the cause of learning and art. The inspiration of Christian truths has stirred the soul to the highest music and to the most magnificent architecture, and to pure sculpture and beautiful painting. Many a cathedral is the nation's

art gallery. The Church of Rome has steadily cherished the aesthetic and artistic feelings of men. It has made use of men's skill for magnifying the mission of the Church and revealing the purpose of God amongst the children of men. The Church in thus making use of all forms of art has set them apart to the sole service of God. The result is sacred art, sacred music, sacred song, and a sacred edifice where men meet for worship. With the highest ideals men have been inspired to their work of art far beyond the possibility of low motives and commonplace themes.

The world would be the poorer, if there had been no Church of Rome thus to utilize and exalt the art of pure-minded men. They, too, were inspired like the men who wrote the sacred Scriptures, and their workmanship has ever been an inspiration, a lamp to the feet, the candle of the Lord, a means of grace. These excellences of the Church of Rome most Protestants will be ready to appreciate.

(10) Having viewed these nine features of the Church of Rome, which the Protestant would do well to appreciate, there remains one more idea, deserving careful consideration, and that is, Protestantism should so appreciate Roman Catholicism, and Roman Catholicism should so appreciate Protestantism, that they will gladly join forces in combating materialism, godlessness and evil in the world. They can unite in works of mercy; they can co-operate in establishing hospitals and orphanages; they can cheer each other in the proclamation of the Gospel, and the spread of spiritual ideas, and the cultivation of the spiritual life. Whatever our views concerning the Holy Pontiff, we can rejoice in all his efforts for the bringing in of the day of peace, of Christian brotherhood, of Church unity, and the fellowship of the Spirit. All advance made by the Church of Rome in establishing a kingdom of righteousness should be reciprocated by all devoted Protestants. As another has said,

"Let Catholicism add to Protestantism its spirit of worship, its sacramental life, its unwavering faith, and its rich heritage of continuity with the historic past. And let Protestantism, on the other hand, add to Catholicism its fearlessness of learning, its stern conception of individual responsibility, and its emphasis upon personal religion. So shall we have in the great Church of the future, not an impoverished and shadowy form of Christianity fenced about with barriers of exclusion, but a Church which is enriched with all the wealth of the Christian ages."

Then will come fulfilment of the petition of Christ, "that they all may be one".

II. Religion and the Brotherhood of Nations

In previous addresses we have dwelt on the importance, the worth, and the fascination, of bringing about the spirit of concord and conciliation between one religion and another, or between different schools of religious thought within the same religion. Our method has been to express appreciation of others and of others' creeds. While fairness united with friendliness, and friendliness united with fairness are difficult to attain in discussions of religion, the general result of our conferences has been most satisfactory. Mutual good-will among persons of religious conviction is by no means an impossibility. . . .

Perhaps it would be well, in these days when the ties between men and nations are being broken, when dark clouds rest on the face of the earth, if the method of appreciation applied so effectively to the great religions were also applied to the great nations, to republics, kingdoms and empires. At present we content ourselves with the true significance of nationalism and internationalism, of patriotism and brotherhood, of loyalty to one's own government and devotion to the federation of the world, and then we touch on the bearings of a general religious sentiment upon these two opposing tendencies in the political and social life of our common humanity.

Patriotism is a virtue which for many centuries has been looked upon by many peoples as supreme. Inter-

nationalism, on the other hand, is an idea which human minds are just beginning to understand, a virtue which is only slightly appreciated and is seldom made supreme. The true relation between these two virtues is not clearly determined, and many fail to see how the one can be cherished without excluding the other.

First, then, the virtue of patriotism, the conception of nationalism. While familiar to us in the West, it has been said there is no word for patriotism in the Chinese language. True, there is no one word or character, but there has always been the idea, expressed in many apt phrases, while of late years a new expression has come into being, whose meaning is "love of country". Its affinity to the dearest ties is seen in the word "fatherland", used by Greeks and Romans, Germans and French; in the phrase "mother country", used by the English, and in the phrase "one family", used by the Chinese.

The quality of love or affection for one's country has never been the predominant note in the Chinese conception of duty to the State. It is a conception which has come largely through the Chinese living abroad, being strangers in a strange land, and then returning to the home land. It is a quality which is spreading among the Chinese more and more, as they are able to take part in the affairs of government. That which brings into being this element of patriotism is the idea of democracy.

The typical characteristic of Chinese patriotism, a characteristic observed in all forms of patriotism, is loyalty. This applies not only to the official in his attitude to the head of the nation, be he president, king or emperor, but to each individual in his relation to the government. "Make loyalty and fidelity supreme" was the teaching of Confucius. Of late years the revolutionary spirit has meant love of country without loyalty to the government or the ruler. In the final outcome it will be found that the only patriotism which can compete with the patriotism of people of other countries is that

which has the stability of loyalty as well as the fervour of affection.

Another element of patriotism, whatever the people, is the willingness to render service, make sacrifices, and even to die, for the country. In times of peace this means faithful performance of duty, with the laudable ambition to enhance the glory and prestige of one's country. If the Chinese have appeared lacking in this quality, it is because they have had no part in the government. In times of war this spirit of self-sacrifice for the sake of the State may mean service on the battlefield. In the latter case there often arises the dilemma as to whether the fighting is in defence of one's country or is for aggression and conquest. If it be the latter, then patriotism as a virtue is brought into comparison with some other virtue which should dominate all, such as devotion to right or loyalty to truth. Many a time in the history of nations have individual consciences, when allowed individual liberty, exhibited patriotism, heroism and self-sacrifice of the highest type in refusing to fight on the field of battle, and in daring to defend in the presence of cynicism and scorn the higher law of God. . . .

Right here it is easy to turn our thoughts from nationalism to consider internationalism, and from patriotism to the idea of universal brotherhood, for it will be seen that they both unite in devotion to truth and to the higher law.

Fraternity is a conception which had its birth far back among all civilized peoples, but internationalism is a new word and a new idea. It represents co-operation on a universal scale. It recognizes competition the world round. It is one form of universal peace, not by eliminating national distinctions, but by adjusting relations between one nation and another. Internationalism is the practical embodiment of an ideal conception of human brotherhood. It recognizes the unity of the race as it came from the heart of God, and as the goal towards

which the world moves. Above is the one God and Father of all, and below are brother-men. Humanity is one family. The Chinese have two sayings: "All under heaven are one family", and "All within the four seas are brothers". There are ties of affection, of culture, of commerce, of postal communication, of telegraphy, of religious sentiment, of humanitarian aspiration, and of social intercourse, which bind men together in utter disregard of mere national demands. The globe has grown smaller, and earth's inhabitants draw nearer and nearer to each other. Men of one country learn from those of another, and our personal friends include all climes and all nations. The one who travels much is cosmopolitan, and the cosmopolitan spirit exhilarates, just as the insular spirit dries up the sympathies and deadens even religion. To live abroad and mingle with other people liberalizes, and makes living a joy. When in 1900 a little company of many nations were besieged in Peking, they took pleasure in gathering for song at the evening twilight, each national singing his own national anthem.

To be at peace with each other is to set into action the international mind. To be at war puts a cleavage deep down into this globe of ours, and sometimes right up into the heavens. Out here in the Far East we have had in mind for years something of the same kind of international co-operation, first in an institute of learning, and then in a museum and library. Just for the moment, the international idea is under a cloud and is subject to scorn. War has over-shadowed everything. . . .

Both patriotism and internationalism draw near to each other as they bow to the supremacy of God's way, that of peace and righteousness. As they bow before the highest and the best, they clasp hands and vow each to defend the other. The spirit of nationalism and the spirit of internationalism are not mutually antagonistic but mutually helpful. Nationalism represents independence, and independence is essential to national

sovereignty. Internationalism represents interdependence, and this is essential to human brotherhood.

There have been those who have proposed some kind of international congress, that internationalism may have more than an academic value, and that war may be averted. This means more than an international Court of Justice, and much more than an international Court of Arbitration, both of which will be the fruits of the Hague Peace Conferences. In time the idea of various national representatives deciding questions of common interest will no doubt grow, without in any way infringing on the rights of nationality. As bearing on this matter the words of Dr. Trueblood, secretary of the American Peace Society, may be quoted:

> "National sovereignty and independence are not absolute, and in the very nature of the case cannot be. The nations are members of the 'family of nations', and the governments are compelled, in various important matters of common concern, to take counsel of one another, or, in other words, to exercise a joint sovereignty which is beyond the field of national sovereignty, and which no nation can exercise alone."

. . . It is religion in the general, more than some particular religion—religion as it issues from God direct —which sympathizes with and encourages the spirit and the policies of international brotherhood. Some of the great religions, in their zeal for propagating their special tenets and ceremonies, have been more divisive than harmonious, and have penetrated even national sentiments with their divisive spirit. Other religions have been promulgated as local or national faiths, adapted to limited conditions. Lacking the universal outlook, they have thought but little of the important relations which exist between nation and nation and their respective governments. Whatever may be said of the failings of Christians and of different branches of the Christian Church, the true student of history must acknowledge that Christ and His first followers took a broad look over the world, recognized the place of governments and rulers, and the fact of national distinctions, and, with them, en-

joined the duty of worldwide fellowship which leaps the bounds of race or state. They pointed on to coming ages, when war between nations will cease, and all kings and nations will bow to the will of a Universal Will, to the law of love as centred in the Supreme, and embodied and made known in Jesus Christ, whose inspiration will fill all things. Jesus is the universal Brother, God is the universal Father, and through them there will yet come international brotherhood and peace among all men.

The Free Church Viewpoint

By Nolan R. Best,
Editor of The Continent.

Did our Lord Jesus Christ, before he ended his life in the flesh, create among men a formal church organization ordained to stand unchangeable till his coming again? Many million Christians believe that he did. But those are not few who count it a thing incredible that Jesus of Nazareth—spontaneous and fetterless spirit that he was—could ever have attached to any matter of external arrangement so much of concern as this provision would imply. Such Christians feel constrained to testify that they "did not so learn Christ". May their testimony to this understanding of the Master be recorded in the ample and hospitable pages of The Constructive Quarterly without offense to any who think otherwise? Certainly the exposition of their view is bound to be "a free, living and deliberate statement of actual, operative belief" such as the platform of The Constructive magnanimously invites from every quarter.

It is not that any one questions that the Christian Church sprang direct from Christ. Nor does any one make a shadow of doubt that Jesus foresaw a church that would carry on his work after his ascension and left to it in all confidence the missionary task requisite to complete his saving purpose for humanity. But did he ever think it needful that he should furnish such a church with an unalterable constitution, specifying for it a framework of ranks, offices and dignities? Here is where comes the cleft of opinion. And those who answer "no", use no hesitant negative. They challenge the citation of any

page in the evangelical record of the Lord's life, or any least allusion in documents remaining from his apostles, which even remotely hints at a formal charter given by Christ to define the visible aspect of his church.

Of all the potent leaders of humanity it seems quite like an axiom to say that the Prophet who came from Nazareth was the one who cared least for the artifices of external organization. He was the one among them all who most relied on inner spiritual forces. He above all others saw the unseen, and because he did, he accounted the seen of less consequence than any other leader of men has ever dared to rate it. More immediately than any other he sensed the colossal constructing power of invisible life. He knew that life, wherever it has leave to live, makes body for itself infallibly—that every sort of life builds for itself the body appropriate to its kind. Life, therefore, he laid hold on as the tool of his architecture in this world, where lesser seers had no better way to project their purposes into the future than by imposing on their followers a multitude of painstaking precepts or an array of drastic injunctions. But as the Christ had meat to eat that men knew not of, so had he means in hand whose force even to this day men have not learned fully to appreciate. Divinely omnipotent in the use of life, he gave life to his church, and to life's evolution committed the minor accident of what its material incorporation should be.

Simply and quietly while he walked in Palestine Jesus pursued the labours of his ministry with supernal unconcern for collecting and measuring and aligning its results. That unconcern was in deepest meaning his perfect surety of results which could neither fail nor be lost. "All that which the Father giveth me shall come unto me", he said with divine calm, and he appointed no registrar to keep books on the receipt of it. He could abide with patience the long inherent developments of what he did and said among men. According to his own manner of speaking

in his parables, he was a sower who could have joy of the harvest while yet the seed was dying formless in the loam; he was a firebringer who was content if only he saw the slight lambent flame glow above its fuel. He knew it was in the nature of seeds to grow and bring forth increase; he knew it was in the nature of fire to burn farther and farther. And he could trust the nature of things because he perceived that the nature of things rests in the nature of God.

Jesus therefore totally lacked the impulse that provokes in men avid passion for organization. He did not have to see achievements listed and people counted in order to be assured that something had come to pass. He had no wisp of that promotional temper which demands a quick show of things accomplished. He had no glorying to gratify in the paraded circumstance of assemblies and the pomp of ceremonious dignitaries. None other was ever so far as he from the love of pretentious observances. Not the slightest inclination did he ever evince to emulate the vanities and display of either a Sadducean priesthood, a Herodian pseudo-kingship or a Roman procuratorate. He vied with none who lorded it over men.

What possible drift of disposition in him then could turn his mind toward establishing a spectacular ecclesiasticism crystallized in ordinances and regulations? How can we be asked to imagine that such a one as Jesus would bethink himself to embody his life-work in the rigid shape of a constituted society, ordered, officered, standardized, bonded to inflexible precedent and canon, time without end? He, the simple-hearted, the unaffected, the free-spoken and naïve, the clairvoyant poet-soul, the sympathetic comrade of an unaspiring peasantry, the caustic satirist of those who loved chief seats in the synagogues and "would be called of men, Rabbi"—by what feat of fantasy shall we contrive to think of this man as ordaining priests, consecrating prelates and appointing pre-

cedence for the greater and subordination for the less in a perpetual hierarchy of rulers over his church?

If in the gospels there were written reports of our Lord's thus founding a sacrosanct officialdom, it would impose on the studious much puzzle to reconcile that single sign of formal temper with his otherwise wholly informal spirit. But why should we manufacture the puzzle for ourselves when no faint shadow of it crosses the consistent record? We do not forget, indeed, that Jesus "chose twelve whom he named apostles", but not even in that circumstance does there appear the token of an organizing purpose. Rather the uncalculating hunger of a lonely man for some trustworthy fellowship is the instinct intimated in the simple gospel narratives of this choice. "He appointed twelve that they might be with him", is the characteristic directness of Mark's statement. True, the Master planned also "that he might send them forth to preach"—after they had been "with him" long enough to appreciate at least a little of his "good news"—yet even so he did not send them out under any ceremonial sanction comparable to modern ordination by a church.

The name "apostles" by which he called these twelve bore less of an official note then than the term "missionaries" carries today; it was at most no more organizational in sound to them than "messengers" is to us. No syllable from the evangelists suggests that Christ "set apart" his representatives with any act more formal than a brotherly wayside talk of counsel and admonition. They went out among the towns of Galilee and Judaea not as hieratic legates commissioned to introduce a new creed of faith and constitute new congregations of believers, but only as simple itinerant preachers directed to speak in the ears of the people fresh tidings touching the solemnity and the hopefulness of their times. The authority then imparted to them by their divine Leader—of whose divinity at that stage of their experience they still remained dully unconscious—was not in the dimmest

semblance ecclesiastical; it was but a beneficent mastery over certain bodily and psychic ills imparted to them not at all for any sake of enhancing their own importance but wholly to make them more practically helpful to their fellow men. In this first aspect of their ministry the twelve seem to have received no more ample investment of duties or power than was given a little later to "seventy others" in whom no orthodox expositor has ever seen the foreshadowing of a permanent sacerdotal order.

It is true that as the last tragic months of our Lord's earthly career drew on, he did speak to these dozen nearest friends of his in larger, though more mystic, terms of what he expected from them as ministers in his name to the world. They had grown by that time to some better perception of the spiritual meaning of his life, and so he could begin to talk to them of a spiritual service to mankind deeper than the healing of the sick and the exorcism of demons. He would have them learn the more sacred secret of guiding sin-sick souls to the assurance of sins pardoned through himself and of awing sin-callous souls with the penalties of sins unforgiven. So on that day when Peter confessed the common conviction of his divine Sonship to which the twelve had attained, Jesus made mention of the keys that opened to men, or locked them from, the kingdom of heaven. Soon afterward he specifically told them all what on the former occasion he had seemed to say to Peter alone—that with them as his "messengers" must lie the duty of binding and loosing the ties that the commandments of God throw around the consciences of men.

Here, indeed, formalist interpretations of Christianity think to find their stoutest intrenchment. But such as have looked in vain elsewhere in the New Testament for tokens of instituted church authority read here only the direction of the Lord's servants to a task—not the appointment of his vicars to official place. It was not of authority that our Lord was speaking when he talked to his companions

about binding and loosing and about the kingdom's keys, but of responsibility. He wished them to feel the sobering weight of having to be the communicating medium of his message to mankind. Through them sinning men were to hear how they could escape the just reward of their deeds and inherit the salvation of heaven. Through them men desiring to do the will of God were to learn what the will of God is. No wonder the tone in which he described to them this burden of duty was of the solemnest—the figures of speech which he used to impress it exalted and awesome. Yet the responsibility of which he forewarned them was by no means exclusively apostolic.

It weighs still on the heart of every follower of Jesus, lay as well as clerical, who mingles with men who have not yet accepted Christ. Each present disciple as truly as any of the twelve carries the keys of the kingdom of heaven for his irreligious neighbours, for except they receive the kingdom's invitation through him they will not receive it at all; God will send no angel from heaven to bid them come in. And the law of God will hold sway over the lives of men, in this time as in every age, only if the friends of Jesus make it binding by their example and their teaching. Surely it is no stretch or strain of the Lord's intent which thus extends his "Whatsoever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven" (Matthew 18: 18) to the whole multitudinous fellowship of believers, for no one hesitates to apply in that universal and unofficial sense the two verses which immediately follow. If it is only to a sacramental order of ecclesiastics that the authority of binding and loosing pertains, why should it not be held that only for two bishops is promised the answer of the Father to agreeing prayer, and that the presence of Christ is granted only where two or three bishops are gathered together?

At all events, there is as little indication after these conversations as before that the twelve apostles thought of themselves as dignitaries elevated to definite office in a

church organization. So far from feeling that their positions had been fixed for them in an established scale of importance, they were still crudely wrangling among themselves, up to the very hour of their Master's passion, trying to settle that exact question which Jesus had failed to settle—who of them should be the greatest. Evidently the others saw no reason to concede any superiority to that one among their number who is now reputed to have been made their premier when Christ spoke to him concerning the rock on which the church would be built. Why should they? Had they not heard him incur, just a few moments later, the most humiliating rebuke that the Lord ever addressed to any man in company with him? Peter, it would seem, was far more impressed with himself than any of his companions were with him. And if the Master had cared at all to bequeath to Peter any peculiar official prestige in the church, he would certainly have been compelled to interfere in his behalf for the repression of insubordinate feelings among the rest of the twelve. Instead, he impatiently dismissed their whole ado about worldly precedence as a childish absurdity over which they could not possibly be troubling themselves if they realized how great a life of spiritual service he had called them to. How emphatically he told them then that in this world there should never be any among them exercising authority over the brethren.

The bond that held the twelve together in their Lord's lifetime was then very evidently no official consciousness or official obligation. They were bound to one another by the simple fact alone that the noblest Man they ever knew had asked them to be his friends, and association with him had knit them to one another until not even their ill concealed mutual jealousies could drive them into animosity. Being his friends they had to be friends of one another. And when one among them strangely shook off the spell of the Personality that had so completely mastered them, the eleven loyal ones marvelled

not that he was turning his back upon an office—they had never been aware of any office to which he was appointed —but that he could be base enough to be traitor to such a Friend.

The Chief of the group, however, knew how soon the magnetism that had welded them thus into brotherhood must be withdrawn. What means to provide which should hold them in unity still after he was gone, was an uppermost thought in the Master's mind that night in the upper room after Judas had gone forth to work his treason. Would they fall apart when no longer they could walk with him in the flesh along the rough roads of Judaea and Galilee? No, he must make sure of vivifying among them after his departure such a living memory of himself as would keep their souls open to the unifying power still flowing from his spiritual presence. So it was that in that grave and solemn night before his crucifixion he set them the example of a simple memorial meal which he desired them often to imitate until he summoned them to drink with him new in his Father's kingdom its sacramental wine. The custom, he well appreciated, would at every observance revive in their hearts the recollection of all that his love and life had blessed them with and a freshened consciousness of all that his sacrificial death had obligated them to. And thus with quickened pictures of the suffering Lord and poignant challenges for resworn allegiance to him, the recurring feast must bring also a powerful renewal of their "love of the brethren" in whose fellowship the memorial was celebrated and in whose fraternity its vows of service were necessarily to be performed.

Moreover, after his resurrection and before his ascending into heaven, the Lord named to his disciples also the familiar rite of baptism as one added token by which the company who loved him might be aware of those who separated themselves from all else in order that they might belong to Christ. These two visible customs Jesus

left to unite those who sought the brotherhood of his church. But he left no others. And even these he ventured so little to render rigid and constraining on the spirit of his followers that for neither sacrament did he prescribe a ceremonious form or fix rules by which to judge its regularity. The barest skeleton of a suggested liturgy is all the cue that he offered either for the celebration of the Lord's supper or the administration of baptism. And the whole manner of his instituting both rites promises that the Master will be pleased with any fashion of observing either which shares the mind and purpose that were his when he granted their commemorative significance to his disciples. That a soul in tune with his soul could break this bread of communion with him, or for his sake apply baptismal waters to a sinner repentant of sins, and Christ reject the act because the administrant had not enjoyed a certain sort of ordination, or because he wetted with the water less or more of the convert's body, is a conception irreconcilable with the Master's whole attitude toward both sacraments.

Beyond this, if the gospels may be relied on for a complete representation of his measures to shape the character of his future church, Jesus did nothing at all in the way of external prescription. After he had risen, he told the eleven who remained of his old circle of intimates that they were to go on preaching for him just as he had taught them to do in the quiet days before the crucifixion —only now they were to travel with his word in ever-increasing circles just as far as their feet, winged with the will to do his will, would carry them. To a hundred and twenty followers, gathered on the slopes of Olivet a few moments before a cloud received him out of their sight, he said that he expected them to be his witnesses from Jerusalem to the uttermost parts of the earth. So he was gone. And he had deputized nobody to stand in his place; he had delegated no one to hold any office; he had designated none to exercise sway over the kingdom

he taught them to pray for. He had appointed no senates or courts or curias. No company of men or women were ever left with less understanding of what they ought next to do, than the hundred and twenty in the Jerusalem upper room—bewildered nucleus of what was to be a world-conquering church. There was no semblance of organization among them. Their absent Master had imposed on them no injunction except "Wait"!

But Jesus had not miscalculated. Neither had he gone away in careless abandonment of his mission. He had not resigned his followers to be the victims henceforth of their own guideless and blundering experiments. In that last unforgettable talk which he had with his eleven companions in the dark midnight hours before Judas came to take him, Jesus pledged them that he would not leave them comfortless or untutored amid their tasks; he would send them One always ready at their call (such seems the root-meaning of the word Jesus chose to describe this new Counsellor) who would teach them all the deep things of truth and duty which they were not yet prepared to hear from himself. So it was in charge of this ever-present Divine Aid—"he, the Spirit of truth" —Guide "into all the truth"—that the infant church was left for tutelage. Not the bequeathed legislation of a departed Founder, but the living voice of God's Holy Spirit, as decisive and authoritative as the voice of God's Holy Son when he abode in the flesh, became the regulating law of the kingdom of heaven on earth. And the Spirit had his way in the apostolic epoch as he has had since.

Either because of some reminiscence of that not-yet-explained saying from Jesus linking Peter and the "rock" on which he would build his church, or simply because of Peter's native facility in address, it was Peter who first stood up with an organization proposal among the waiting friends of Jesus betwixt Ascension and Pentecost. He evidently had that day something in mind of the notion,

still familiar, that the apostolate was an office to be endlessly preserved by due succession of a new appointee to every vacancy. So he called on the company to fill up the number of the twelve with a substitute for Judas the betrayer. But when Pentecost came, this dream that had prevailed for an idle interval quickly faded. The Spirit corrected the error. The apostolate became once more a work and not a position. Peter preaching mightily in the power of God—Peter at his work—did become indeed a foundation rock for the rapidly rising structure of the church. But how soon it became manifest that the Spirit would give honour to one and another not according to the prestige of a past dignity or a remembered usefulness, but only according to each one's present measure of abundance in labours and fruits.

Very shortly it was not Peter but James the Lord's brother (scoffer in Christ's lifetime but convert of a resurrection vision) whose power of ministry advanced him to pre-eminence among followers of "The Way". He consequently for a period was the outstanding leader of the church—although when the empty place in the circle of the twelve was being filled he had not been so much as thought of for a nominee. None the less, when his service went beyond the service of others, the church of that apostolic hour, true to its Lord's teaching, recognized him as the greatest among them, and because he was so nobly efficient as a "messenger" of the gospel, hesitated not at all to hail him as manifestly a true apostle.

Then there came another, and after his Lord there was none else so mighty in the church of God as he. Yet he never saw Jesus in the body—or if he did, looked on him only in scorn. He was never of those that "companied with us", as Peter had impetuously specified to be needful in the apostleship. No bishop ever laid hands on his head to ordain him; no church council ever elected him to a hierarchal see; no hand of official welcome ever drew

him within a college of governing ecclesiastics. He had, if any ordination at all, only an informal consecration for missionary service under the hands of a group of "prophets and teachers" among whom he already had full standing as a junior compeer. He carried no credentials of human signature. Yet he claimed to be an apostle as fully as any other, and the sheer weight of his limitless labours made the claim good beyond all cavil of dispute.

Of those who were given out to be highly placed in the church, Paul had never any subordinate awe. Peter he "resisted to the face", despite the great tradition of Pentecost that must have still enveloped that most eloquent of primeval preachers. Paul's assurance was his own "heavenly vision", and early or late he "conferred not with flesh and blood". Casting himself absolutely athwart every line that was ever drawn to describe the requirements of a formalist church, Paul was nevertheless unmistakably the greatest minister of Jesus Christ that ever lived. And Christianity today has more of his stamp on it than of any other mind save the mind of the Master himself. How then can we be persuaded that the church which he gave his life to and which he shaped as no other human hand has shaped it, is to be comprehended under formularies that he could have tolerated, "no, not for an hour"? If Paul were asked to bow to a pontificate maintained in the name of a man whose example he reprehended and whose influence he shook off his shoulders, what would he say? And what can we say who look to Paul as the supreme human statesman of the Kingdom of God?

How Paul felt about every churchly counterpart of that Pharisaism he had once so gloried in—but after Damascus so bitterly repudiated—may vividly be seen in the pages of his epistle to the Galatians. What a thrilling document in praise of spiritual freedom that fervid writing is. As later through Greece, Paul had gone

preaching through Galatia, "Where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty." But there had come after him other teachers proclaiming "a different gospel"—a gospel which said that the Spirit of the Lord is not where liberty is, but only where there is observed an unbroken uniformity of ceremonial, where a particular rite is practiced with historic precision, where men make themselves merit by conformity and purge their sins by deeds of ritual piety. And when Paul heard that his own sowing of spiritual truth was being choked by these thorns and briers of legalism, his wrath rose high; his grief was like a parent's grief for prodigal children. "O foolish Galatians", he cried, "who did bewitch you?"

To Paul's thought only the bewitched could be misguided enough to exchange the experienced freedom of life in the spirit for the drudgery of serving the unyielding letter of the law. His pleadings for the Galatians to claim again their inheritance of unfettered sonship in the freeborn family of a great-hearted Father are among the most moving and impassioned words of Scripture. "Now that ye have come to know God", wrote he, "or rather, to be known by God, how turn ye back again to the weak and beggarly rudiments whereunto ye desire to be in bondage over again? Ye observe days and months and seasons and years. I am afraid of you lest by any means I have bestowed labour on you in vain." How literally his heart was wrenched with pain over what a soul less ample in understandings might easily have called an insignificant eccentricity among his beloved converts. "Let them have their rites and ceremonies if they will", a thousand notables in the church might have counselled; "what harm if they adopt some needless adjunct to their religion? Have they not at least the essential reality still embedded in their forms?"

But Paul was unable to look so leniently on "weak and beggarly rudiments". To him it spelled degeneration that a Christian should turn to trifle with worthless

punctilios of worldly contrivance when the infinite privilege of "being known by God" in constant daily converse of the spirit was summoning him to heavenly and eternal things. It was like preferring to shut one's self within the narrow and narrowing confines of a prison dungeon when all the reach of God's open air invited one forth to illimitable room. It was slavery, bondage—and voluntary, needless bondage at that. How the horror of it roused the apostle's soul! What a pealing trumpet voice it is in which he announces to the Galatians the Christian's emancipation proclamation: "For freedom did Christ set us free." And even nobler and stronger, if possible, is the lofty note of his ensuing exhortation to claim and enjoy their emancipated right: "Stand fast, therefore, and be not entangled again in a yoke of bondage."

Who will wonder if that call to be free in Christ, still across all the centuries, sounds with imperative command in it to untold thousands whom insistent contemporaries beg to believe that the perfect unity of Christendom might soon be attained if they would but agree to accept certain ancient devices of ecclesiastical government and hoary opinions of sacramentarian regularity? When one to his deepest heart wishes that even the approximation of that unity might begin to grow into realization in his own day, such an appeal to conform is indeed constraining. One is always on the point of yielding—of saying, "Well, have it so if you will; let us call bishops or even popes necessary to a valid church of Christ if that will bring union"—until one looks back to Paul and beyond him to Jesus. Can one then consent to be less steadfast in loyalty to Christian liberty than was Paul?

Can one allow to the world or to his differing brethren that Jesus considers the office and title of bishop important when one is very sure that Jesus never cared for anybody's office or any kind of title "from the foundation of the world" until this present moment? Or can one agree

that the sacraments are worthless when not done according to a certain specified manner if one is convinced that the God who looks not on the outward appearance but on the heart would by very nature be incapable of discounting for faults of external manner any worship whatever offered to his name by sincere souls? Does one, in a word, dare undertake for any cause the responsibility of restricting the reach of freedom with which, as it seems to him, Jesus Christ originally endowed his church?

Yet this does not in any manner or degree signify that we are religious anarchists. As well and as firmly as the stoutest adherents of episcopacy we know that the church of God in this world must be governed. Our predilections, we confess, are decidedly in favour of its being governed democratically rather than autocratically, yet we do not for a moment imagine that the rule of prelates in any part of the church prejudices God against that part. It is not even difficult for the most of us to imagine ourselves dwelling contentedly in our places among the people of Christ with leaders of episcopal authority over us—certain understandings being granted as to the source and character of their power. We are not at all averse to keeping the apostle's injunction, "Obey them that have the rule over you", even if those that have the rule over us chance to be called bishops. But what in conscience we cannot abide is subscribing our names to the prescription that nothing but episcopal government can gather a body of Christ's people within the scope of his valid church—when we are convinced that Christ himself never prescribed any such thing.

From our point of view, in a profound sense, "whatever is, is right" in the realm of church organization. Or to say the least, it is bound to come right eventually. This is because our faith is so sure that the Holy Spirit working in the hearts of those who submit to his leading is able to shape the church of today into whatever form and frame God can best use for his glory. The Spirit

will take care of the church polity question and every other question if men and women cease to hinder him. It is only because in the pride of human opinion Christians of many minds persist in determining by artificial stipulations how and whereby the Spirit shall work that he is unable to work. To the thought which is here expounded it appears very clear that the claim set up in behalf of an indispensable episcopate is such an artificial stipulation, wholly man-made. If with all like barriers this dogma of the church's changeless form were once thrown down, God's providence in the free field so laid open would soon suit form to living need all the world over. If the form came out episcopacy, presbyterianism, independency or what not, all well and good. We should only care to know that it was not moulded by men's imposed theorizing, but was the immediate product of the divine life to which "God giveth a body even as it pleased him".

And this leads to saying that we who reason thus concerning the constitution of the church are careless neither of the church's continuity nor of its unity. But we do say that for insuring continuity form is a poor reliance in comparison with life. Life is the one thing known to human observation which is infallibly continuous. The best guarded forms of things do change beyond recognition, but life returns ever renewed in indubitable generic likeness. And if the miracle of generation proves life's persistence in the realm of biology, no less does the miracle of regeneration prove it ceaselessly in the kingdom of heaven. If a man must be born again in order to have a share in the kingdom of God, then the life into which he is born constitutes forever an unmistakable token of the kingdom. And there is no other token unmistakable. The species-mark of the Christian is on his living soul—not on his body, still less on his vesture. And so long as God is able to bring sons and daughters to spiritual birth by the travail of their Saviour, none need dread

that the church which composes God's family will stand in peril of losing its identity or require the aid of outward insignia to prove its divine character.

As for unity, "the body is not one member but many", yet in all these members "worketh the one and the same Spirit". While men talk of requiring visible uniformities as conditions of church union, union remains remote. But when we accept the guidance of "the same Spirit" as Jesus appointed, he will create unity in his own way deeper than any uniformity. Then the world will see one church, yet one with many exterior diversities. For in the loftiest liberty of God it will be a free church.

The War and the Moral Crisis

By Georges Michelet,
Professor of Philosophy in the Catholic Institute of Toulouse.

Of the many agonizing problems—military, political, social and economic—raised by the present war, is there one of a more tragic reality, a more disturbing gravity for souls, than the moral problem? For millions of human beings the plan of life has been suddenly and totally changed. And in place of duties which they have been accustomed to face in the regularity of a peaceful existence and with the consolation of domestic intimacy, there have surged up new obligations, imperious and formidable. And, in this existence thus brusquely overthrown, now made up of hours of magnificent exaltation and of long days of inexpressible inner anguish, everything seems changed for millions of soldiers—their occupations, fears, hopes, reasons for living, even their reasons for dying.

And these new obligations present themselves with an implacable distinctness. The time has passed when moral theories clashed in empty space, far above souls, in abstract systems ignored by the crowd; when philosophers in their comfortable libraries, oblivious of the actual conditions of the moral life, constructed doctrines for unreal beings. Here, duty, suffering, death, are realities every hour. Here, for each one of the combatants the problem presents itself as a personal problem with an immediate application: the question is, his suffering, his distress, perhaps his imminent death, and the moral reasons that compel his acceptation of these. Each one

of these duties is thus localized, actualized, particularized, and in the concrete form in which it is presented it takes for each the character of a sensation and of something lived.

And the duties thus made actual no longer offer themselves to consciences in the poesy of metaphysical dreams but in a setting of poignant realism. It is no longer a question of that imperturbable courage whose cloudless serenity the rhetoricians glorify. Feet are in the mud, bodies are shivering in the fog of the nights, souls fail at the remembrance of absent loved ones. And the death which is there does not at all resemble death all adorned with peaceful grandeur, as the ancient ideal presents it; or the end of the sage, glorified in the moral manuals, in the peace of old age, in the evening of a life wholly filled with goodness. Here, it is death in repugnant shape, the spectacle of which is unceasingly before one's eyes—the body mangled by the bullet, the flesh bleeding, in the whole horror of battle, or in the grievous solitary agony. And this facing of death—and such a death—for months requires the conscience of all these beings to acquiesce in it by the decision of their moral freedom.

Notice, too, that these strange obligations are not proposed to the intellectual *élite*, to a handful of heroes with ardent hearts. By the conditions of modern warfare millions of men, for whom the observance of ordinary duties was difficult in the past, are required to practise all the renunciations, and this without any preparation to train them for a continuous heroism.

Thus the present war sets the moral problem in all its keenness. It makes real the decisive experience, the *crucial* experience (in Bacon's sense), and—if one may say so in a matter so sorrowful—a favourable opportunity to judge of the efficacy of moral systems for souls. And it is perhaps useful to make anew and openly that examination which must have been pursued silently in the depths of hearts: What are the present needs of our

souls, and in this distress what resources are offered us by contemporaneous moral systems?

I

The first necessity of souls in this torment seems indeed to be a necessity for light. Above all we try to understand. Torn rudely from their ordinary preoccupations, these souls have been hurled into the full confusion of the battle. Then, when the only question in all official discourses was universal peace and civilization, when the activity of the scientific and economic world represented an immense endeavour to alleviate human life, behold at a single stroke a return to the epochs of bloodshed, the world upheaved, and the worst scourge which humanity has ever suffered. And in the overwhelming surprise of these events souls demand anxiously: Why?

Not alone the military, the political, the economic reason for this war—our spirit is raised higher than this, even to eternal problems. Why is there fratricidal struggle between men? Why suffering and death in the world? Whither, then, is the universe going through such horrors? And, for me, whence comes the moral obligation deliberately to throw myself into this confusion and, if necessary, to die there? We all yearn to know the eternal reason for these evils. We seek for light to illumine the shadows in the midst of which we are struggling; we implore a clear, complete explanation, an explanation which embraces heaven and earth, life and death. And, without knowing it, we thus appeal to the whole of metaphysics.

And next to light our souls have an immense need of strength. The explanation sought must not merely enlighten, it must even more sustain us. The obligations which are presented to consciences are too grievous, the sacrifices are too great, for human wills—even those of the finest temper—to bear in certain hours without

failing. Whence then may be drawn the power for these sacrifices and, if necessary, the heroism for the supreme sacrifice? And towards what master of the inner life shall we turn to ask with these lessons of renunciation the strength necessary to make our souls equal to the test? Finally, because human beings are not able to live long without joy, their true sphere; because obligation cannot be accepted and fulfilled in all the completeness of its moral value except it expand finally in love, we demand what doctrine will bring to us a little happiness in the bitterness of our sacrifices and our tears.

Thus, in the midst of the tests presented hourly, souls are groping everywhere about them in an anxious seeking for the sources whence there shall come to them the threefold comfort of light, of strength, and of consolation.

And this is why the moral teaching from which this peace shall descend upon them must be presented, above all, as a doctrine. Less now than ever is it sufficient for us to point out imperatively what obligations are presented to us. An enumeration of these obligations, apart from their rational justification, a *fact* of the reason as Kant says, a pure moral discipline, will be incapable of satisfying this so pressing need for light. These human beings put to such tests have an imperative right to clarity. And as it is their glory to die face to face with the enemy, it is their nobility to be reasonable and their desert to be free to fulfil that obligation in complete light of conscience and under the radiance of motives that make it legitimate. It is necessary to enter into the obligation of the war, so grave, so formidable, as Plato wishes it—with all the soul and from the very first in the clear vision of the grandeur and the sanctity of the sacrifice.

Thus a decalogue which will be only a recitation of obligations will not know how to respond to the needs of

souls; it is necessary to connect it with its demonstration, and by this demonstration to a supreme explanation of all things; then only will it be possible for a reflection of that universal intelligibility to descend upon the understanding and, as Spinoza desired, to illumine present obligations with the light of the things which are eternal; then only is death linked with life, and life with the universe; and that which is ephemeral with that which passes not away. And the human being is able to understand how his suffering and his death, without losing anything of their individuality or of their worth, are but a phase in the progress of the universe. Thus in each soldier by the incitement of suffering a metaphysician is awakened which only a doctrine, and that in all its completeness, can appease.

But a first condition is, that it shall be a doctrine of life. For the combatant who shivers in the cold and under the rain it is no longer a time for the pleasures of contemplation and for the abstract systems in which the dialectical virtuosity of our contemporaries was exercised. It is necessary that eternal explanations descend upon his life as from the profundity of the heavens the twinkling of the stars comes to the very earth. Then only this light will be his light and this doctrine will be transformed into a concrete indication of his duty at the present moment.

But even this vision of duty thus concrete will not suffice. It would be the cold light of which Gratry spoke, and what is needed is a light that carries its warmth into hearts. This doctrine must express a doctrine of action. That clarity would not be sufficient which would lead intelligences to submit silently to the hard necessities of war. What matters is, that this doctrine be an exaltation of life and a source of enthusiasm; it is necessary that it magnify obligation and cause it to appear in its grand and inspiring beauty. One demands of it that it bend all the energies of these beings and that it hurl them toward the accomplishment of the obligation in a

triumphal assault, and, instead of awaiting death, if it be necessary, to go to meet it and to hasten toward it as to a fête,—not the brutal fête of blood and death, but the fête of a sacrifice fully recognized, fully consented to, ardently loved. Under these conditions alone will a moral doctrine respond to the aspirations of the present hour; together with light for the understanding it will carry to hearts the ardent flame; it will teach not only how to "hold" before duty but how to go toward it with a decisive impulse and with all one's being. It will exalt will in us, that intention of victory of which General Foch could write in his *Doctrine de guerre* as the essential and all powerful factor: the intention of power which ends in its realization.

But these forces and these joys cannot proceed except from a doctrine of optimism, and an optimism which may reach the individual. For optimism alone is the creator of energy, the fertile source of action, it alone possesses the potent faculty of multiplying living forces, it alone compels the unfolding of all the heroism latent in souls. But this optimism implies that life and death, the suffering of individuals and the martyrdom of peoples have a moral significance, that they tend toward a sovereign judgment where account will be taken of all the silent sacrifices and unnamed virtues. It declares that a Thought guides the world toward the better and toward the best, and that good will triumph in the coming of justice. This assurance of the final triumph of good alone can create courage and sustain hope.

All souls in the present hour have an infinite need of hope and to see beyond the sorrows and the conflicts a reign of justice and a blessed city of peace. They beg that the immortal hopes of heaven be revealed to their agonized hearts or their weeping eyes.

But this optimism must justify itself not only for the general good, not only for societies unjustly attacked or

cruelly martyred, but also for each individual. It is the sacrifice of each soul; every part of this unknown suffering is that of a soul lost in the crowd who must have his feelings, must recognize his triumph, taste his recompense. As for each one of us and of our acts the moral doctrine which we desire so ardently must justify each particular obligation, as it is necessary that it become for each one of us a source of energy, it is expedient above all that it carry consolation for every sorrow. And each soul must find there all its light, its strength and its joy.

II

This succour so ardently desired, will it come from doctrines which pretend to guide life only by the lessons of experience, and should it be, at first sight, naturalism which would represent the liberating doctrine of the present hour? According to it the spontaneous and irresistible *élan* of our nature toward happiness expresses the essential law of our conduct. And life offers us with an inexhaustible liberality its pleasures, facile, immediate, enchanting. Does it not invite us by all its alluring voices to take our part in the feast always prepared? And, to vanquish the repugnance of the reasonable being, contemporary naturalism proclaims the right to happiness. Life must be lived completely, intensively. It infers the free unfolding of our activity.

And behold how the war makes its grave and severe lessons heard. No, life is not the perpetual fête which we have been told; it has its sorrowful stages, its hard necessities. There are hours in it when it is necessary to tear oneself away from all pleasures, even the legitimate, from gentle and dear affections, even the sacred, before the imperious call of duty. At that call throughout his life man must hasten toward duty, as at a signal given he hastened to the mobilization and toward the enemy. The exaltation of life is realized for the individual only upon the summits of sacrifice. It is sacrifice

which enlarges souls, purifies them, ransoms them. It is sacrifice which assures the fulness and the fruitfulness of life. Asceticism expresses the fundamental law of all enrichment of the soul and of all morality; the royal way of renunciation is always the road to be travelled by every human creature in his journey toward the heights.

Thus the war, in spite of its horrors, attests with power the necessity, the nobility and the sanctity of duty. It brings affirmation of moral discipline, it establishes the exaltation of suffering and of immolation. And see how the military chiefs find again instinctively, in their orders of the day, the solemn and profound words of the ascetic authors: renunciation, gift of self, the spirit of sacrifice. The war is an apotheosis of that asceticism which the present-day world thrusts away with terror. In its turn it thus becomes the condemnation of the depressing and wretched doctrines of naturalism.

Evolution makes a large place for sacrifice so that its doctrine is wholly filled with it. Life presents, not a feast, but a sombre tragedy. Humanity cannot advance toward the better except by marching across dead bodies, and its route is everywhere staked out by millions of innocent victims. Conflict without mercy expresses the history of the world while it awaits the peace of the future city. Certainly this doctrine will not be reproached for not recognizing the seriousness, the "terrible" seriousness of life. It makes war the lasting foundation of all life and the normal law of all civilization. The triumph of the species alone counts, and this triumph is not paid for too dearly by the sobs and the martyrdom of millions of poor beings.

But where is light for the understanding in this explanation of universal life? Why this necessity for conflict? Who then decrees, commands, this perpetual slaughter? Is it possible that war with its tragic horrors must be everywhere, in all stages of life, and that it represents the tragic law, the inexorable law of humanity? The

bloody vision of that which war is forces the intelligence to revolt against a doctrine which sees it as the necessary and beneficent condition of the progress of humanity. No, progress is not accomplished thus. Hate and conflict cannot be the rule and the leaven of all civilization. Before all else, that is the work of love, the inspiration of the ideal, the impulse of being toward known and desired perfection. War represents only an accident, however grievous, in the life of peoples, as it were, a convulsion of the organism. If that convulsion is prolonged, the being will soon die of it.

And this explanation which causes intelligences to revolt leaves hearts without power for the accomplishment of their duties.

Propose to the soldier who is fighting, who perhaps will soon succumb, this distant ideal of a humanity happy over his dead body; tell him that his tears and his blood are the cement necessary for the future city, that the sacrifice of the individual is inexorably demanded for the good of the species, and that, after thousands of years by this sacrifice of millions of individuals, humanity will know the rapture of perpetual joy. Will consolation come to him, who in his agony is thinking of the dear children who are waiting for him, of the beloved home, of all his imperious and legitimate reasons for living? A crushing doctrine which should awaken hatred against the exigencies of society and this humanity of the future. According to it, there is no joy for the individual but only silent despair. This doctrine allows not a ray of joy, not a consoling motive to pass across its bloody horizons to help in the supreme sacrifice. If it affirms its optimism with regard to the final state of society, it forbids all pity for the victims: this pity for the inept in the struggle constitutes for it an unhealthy charity, *lèse-humanité.*

Evolution thus glorifies war, the triumph of the strong, the brutality of oppression, the crushing of the individual;

it runs counter to the affirmations of our intelligences and the aspirations of our hearts. How should it be, in these tragic hours, the book of consolation which our souls require?

If nature cannot justify this immolation of the individual nor give it a moral value, where then can we discover the source of that obligation? We know that positivism wishes to forbid the search for this reason above the world of experience. To be objective, real, scientific, according to Comte and his disciples, an explanation must be borrowed from the earth: "God not being of the domain of experience". Positivism has cut off the wings which allow the spirit to mount upwards, and when the wings of a bird are broken there is nothing left for him but to hop about on the ground; and as, outside nature, there is nothing on the earth that surpasses the individual save society, it is from this, and of necessity, that the obligation for all sacrifices will flow.

Under the diverse forms which this doctrine will assume among our contemporaries—utilitarianism, solidarity, sociology,—the fundamental affirmation remains always the same: superior to undividuals, Humanity by its power, its continuance, its necessity, presents the modern divinity. In gratitude for benefits received, in clear perception of the superiority of the collective interest over individual conditions, or in obedience to the social commandment, the individual is to submit, to suffer and, if need be, to die. And, pursuing his meditations in the course of his vigil in the trenches, in the face of the enemy, more than one soldier will perhaps ask whence comes to society the discretionary power over his heart and his life. The theorists of the sociological *morale* will tell him to bow before the "social pressure" exercised over him by the collectivity. Just as that imposes upon him a type of architecture, his language, his monies, and even the style of his dress, by a sort of mental coercion, it

regulates also the direction of his life and the orientation of his activity. And the sentiment of duty is but the inner expression and, as it were, the psychological refraction of that compression, a trick of nature for obtaining the acquiescence of man in her designs. But it will soon appear to the person who meditates that the appeal to the "social pressure" removes from his obedience its moral character. Constraint, at least mental, is spoken of, and he knows that this is the negation of duty. In order to be reasonable, before submitting to the exterior command, he wishes his duty to appear first as a light. The social force will perhaps constrain his limbs, will bend his knees and by terror will force him to the assault; but it will not win his true acceptance. The conception of a militarism grows stronger which, instead of exciting his impulse for action, will awaken in his soul a protestation of his rights against this tyranny. Is it thus that souls are ennobled and enthusiasm for difficult virtues aroused in them?

Will one speak to him, then, with the contemporary utilitarians, of the larger interests of society which must prevail for him, the "social will", as they call it? Here we have to do simply with a case of reckoning interest. It is then the question of an affair in which he agrees to weigh attentively the losses and the profits. The losses are evident, and how grievous!—his youth, his future, his home, all the happiness dreamed of long and tenderly. And the profit? Is he certain that his sacrifice at this point is indispensable to society, indeed, will be really useful? Would he not serve society better in his rôle as head of the family and citizen? And if it is a question of interests, why not consider his own, in other respects so legitimate? And, since after all it is a question of dealing with the matter, not with his whole soul, but with the cold reason of a banker—by what right and in the name of what ideal, does society, in a doctrine purely empirical, arrogate to itself this sovereign power? Here, again,

will one believe this balancing of accounts will inspire that ardour of courage, that fervour of patriotism and that intrepid generosity so necessary for a soldier? And since it is necessary to get to that point in the matter, if this utilitarian doctrine is plainly powerless to give moral force to the combatant, what joys does it promise him in the sacrifice? The pride of duty fulfilled, the sentiment of the nobility of sacrifice, the joy of success before one's eyes in the supreme hour?—And how is it with those who will never know them? The triumphal acclamations at the return?—And those who will not hear them? The vision of an immortal country, the establishment of the right, the liberties of nations, the reign of justice?—Great and holy things, but they affirm the definitive expression of individual sacrifices, and that without providing in themselves any compensation. As sociology takes no count of the distress of the individual in whom the social *morale* is uninterested, so it is acknowledged that utilitarianism, more exacting than any religion, demands his complete and definitive sacrifice. Should it be wrong to compare this conception of society with the ancient, bloodthirsty Moloch?

And this is why the task most urgent for certain sociologists is to lead the individual to *have a sense of* that social transcendence by idealizing society in his eyes. Faithful to the thought of Auguste Comte, they apply themselves to making Humanity thus divine. Is it not the creator of everything in man, his thought, his logic, his language, his morality, his religion? Does it not, for him, represent in its beneficent action the visible Providence? Is it not, for him, altogether transcendent by its power, its indefinite duration through the centuries; immanent in everything that it realizes in him? In the spirit of our contemporaries we are compelled by a new mysticism to arouse religious fervour toward society and to make sacred the acceptations of all its orders, even the obligation to die. But for a positive intelligence, initiated

in the sociological researches of the *science of morals* as required by this new moral method, which recognizes the relativity of duties, their variations, and even social errors, has this idealization of society much chance of being manifested? And for the combatant, what a recall to reality! Humanity, beneficent divinity, creator of goodness and of love, tutelary Providence,—everyone may follow the bloody traces of its work throughout this war. If it was necessary, should not the clear vision of its horrors henceforth make impossible this pseudo-mysticism and the fervour of this social adoration?

It is expedient, then, to seek higher than this for the real source of our courage and to lift ourselves up to the austere teachings of reason in order to discover there, if it be possible, the lights and the powers of which our souls have need.

Rationalism considers that intellectual clarity is sufficient to procure for us this light and this force. Reason, our reason, perceives, in effect, in full clarity the necessity of obligation, even the obligation of war; it comprehends what sacrifices are imposed by order, and it affirms with a sovereign authority that rational order, eternal order, order *in itself*, must be respected. The individual must be conscious of this rational necessity and incline himself before it. In the midst of suffering he will perceive at least the high and serene satisfaction of this submission to an eternal judgment, and he will know, if he succumb, that his submission to the moral law continues even in death the affirmation of his autonomy and the magnificent homage of his liberty. An elevated doctrine, certainly. There remains only to know whether it is justified and whether it brings in fact the moral succour which we await.

Rationalism believes that it affords man all light necessary to bend him to hardest sacrifices; it considers this appeal to reason decisive—to the just reason, Aristotle

will say, to the reason not temporal, Kant will think. Certainly if my reason is the reflection of an eternal reason, if the ray which will enlighten descends from the profundity of the heavens, if the obligation flows from an eternal Intelligence, immutable, finally divine, and from a sovereign Will, the imperative of reason, coming from the Absolute, imposes itself absolutely upon me. But if you limit me to my reason, forbidding to me all seeking beyond it, if you desire that I should be in myself the source of my light, my intelligence becomes a skylight which is opened into the night. Whence comes to my reason this terrible law and the requirement of all these sacrifices? Why must the order of reason be respected? Is it necessary, then, that for a logical necessity, for a dialectical satisfaction, I fly to the sacrifice of my heart, of my life, of the happiness of my own! All this for a rational theory! Have I not, after all, "reasons of the heart" just as imperious and more legitimate? Moreover, if it was demonstrated clearly to the reason, this obligation to accept suffering and death would leave me without power and in terror. Should verbal formulas, whose sterility in ordinary life all educators point out, have some virtue in cases otherwise difficult, and for heroic duties? To a human creature who trembles before the prospect of a formidable sacrifice, to a heart which experiences the desolation of all agony, they carry neither encouragement in his weakness nor a word of consolation in his despair. Go forward, go forward to duty, to the assault, and to death: reason tells him, reason orders him! And it is such an abstraction which should move millions of creatures, should sustain them during months in the midst of great sufferings, and urge them toward the supreme assault! O, dupery of words, vanity of formulas, unreality of the purely abstract, for life!

No, life is not guided by the purely abstract, and it does not unfold like a theorem. In the face of obligations, especially the obligations of the present hour,

so great and so burdensome, souls know themselves overwhelmed. To arouse in them that generosity of sacrifice there is needed something other than an axiom of logic or an affirmation of geometry, rather, indeed, a flame in the heart, burning, communicative. Cold rationalism, dry and supercilious, does not lighten at all this burden of obligation. It only crushes their souls under its inflexible affirmation.

A last resource remains for us in such confusion, a last refuge of souls in distress in times of great social crises: we turn toward ancient stoicism and with the necessary courage ask of it the secret of serenity. And contemporary stoicism takes up again the old formulas of antique wisdom. In submitting ourselves to the necessities of exterior things we are able, it tells us, by our will alone to assure our inner happiness. "Retire thou within thyself", said Marcus Aurelius, "to support oneself is of the nature of a reasonable being." To be sufficient to oneself, —behold the saving secret! "Look within", he says again. "The source of good is within thee, an inexhaustible source, provided thou alway seekest it out." Since we carry the good within us, there resides in us also the necessary strength. "We are conscious", says Epictetus, "that with the will we bear within us the supreme strength." No more need, then, for succour descended from heaven for our help. "It is necessary to bend our souls toward the goal, it is necessary to will, and the thing is done. . . . Within us is our destruction and our succour."

"To retire within oneself", "to rely upon oneself", "to hold ourselves upright of ourselves", to discover within us this absolute power—promises and counsels which please the contemporary soul, so jealous of its autonomy. Through the ages there is the same pride of human wisdom. It believes itself to be the principle of its force as well as the source of its light. To the soldier in peril it should repeat with the exalted

lessons of pagan philosophy the words of Seneca: "You will see me like a God in the face of death."

Here, again, is a doctrine exalted and proud, but which prepares for souls who confide themselves to it terrible disillusions. Where to discover the reasons and consolation in such an ordeal? In the thought that death is "rational"?—Irony, and how painful in the present situation! In this conviction that "we are involved with the universe"?—But will the vision of this universal determinism give me a moment of joy or relief in my sacrifice? Will it be presented to me that life is short and that, after all, it matters little that my existence be prolonged for some years?— But will this pessimism console my heart, as a father, a husband, a son? Others will counsel me with Montaigne to "fling myself with lowered head into the black abyss".— But is this the attitude of a reasonable being, or the naïve philosophy which turns the eyes away from peril in order to deny it? Would it be better, just at the edge of the precipice, to look at "the little flower of the mountain" of which Guyau speaks?—A deification of dilettantism which perhaps removes from sacrifice its horror, but even more surely its moral grandeur. There remains the last resource—"the bravest will contemplate all space and all the heavens, they will fill their hearts with immensity, they will endeavour thus to make their souls as great as the abyss". Behold, what a verbal illusion, and to what phraseology modern stoicism is led! Poor soldier who shall have in death only this joy of contemplating the immensity of space!

In reality, in order to bring forward its promises of unalterable serenity, of invincible courage and of souls always valiant, stoicism increases our sorrow and makes us feel more heavy the weight of terrible adversity. In the face of real, continuous suffering, the poetry of all these consolations takes wing and souls experience oppression before the inevitable. The conviction of the universal

determinism and of the inflexible brutality of the eternal laws engenders in them, not submission, but revolt against this anonymous despotism, and this crushing of hearts by fatality. If it be possible, stoicism thus makes life and death more unhappy. And if it increase our sorrows, it destroys beforehand all impulse toward action. The futility of effort is manifested by implacable evidence. To what good, since everything is determined! In place of exciting courage it thus depresses and annihilates it. Claiming to be the creator of heroism, it leads only to the languor of resignation in face of the inevitable. And this resignation, wholly different from Christian resignation, is here the way toward despair. The salvation neither of anything nor of any one is to be expected; the heavens are empty, the universe continues impassible; the soul which suffers is alone in its distress. This autonomy in which it glorified becomes the consciousness of being lost in the universe, and now overwhelms it. Let death come, then, and let it bring deliverance!

For having willed in his pride to be to himself light, power and joy, behold man led, not to the serenity of wisdom, but to inexorable despair. And ever through the ages there is the burden of the divine curse upon the man who claims to be sufficient unto himself in his wisdom and his power.

III

In these meditations silently pursued for months by millions of beings, a comparison has been slowly made between the present needs of souls and the resources offered by contemporary moral doctrines; and it has appeared with an ever-increasing distinctness that these doctrines were not capable of bringing the consolation which is indispensable at the present hour. And this continued reflection has led to evolving some lessons from the war concerning moral doctrine.

(1) It has shown vividly the failure of all moral rationalism. In experience, the dry and cold affirmations of pure reason, in their haughty inflexibility beyond the concrete conditions of existence, are revealed as totally inefficacious to lead souls to the generous acceptation of their difficult obligations. If ideology alone is powerless to direct life, still more reason that it should not claim to direct death. The gifts of speculation bring no courage to a being of flesh and blood who shudders beneath the bullets. This voice of the abstract has little force in the hurly-burly of the battle. Besides, was dialectic alone ever the creator of heroism?

(2) The war makes clear the pedagogical error of those educators who, in reaction against pure intellectualism, claim to act directly upon the will by psychological training. Desiring to utilize for moral teaching the force which religions in general, and Christianity in particular, give to their believers, and at the same time resolved to continue in the plan of laic positivism, they separate religious action from the doctrine that arouses it and conditions it; and they try to adapt to a purely laic *morale* the precedents, the methods and the aids of religious doctrines in order effectively to influence souls—a proceeding singularly artificial and irrational and little worthy of real educators. The error of seeking the efficacious conditions of a doctrine outside the truth of that doctrine, of aiming at a psychology of action independent of a metaphysique which sustains this action, is flagrant. Reflection, especially in grave hours, will soon announce the puerility of this artifice. Moral practice cannot be separated from the moral doctrine which legitimatizes it and vivifies it.

(3) Just as illusory is the recent attempt of sociological moralists; they do not suppress doctrine for the benefit of action, they place them side by side. The moralist initiated in the science of morals will study the relativity of obligations; but in doing this he will hold as absolute

the prescriptions of the common conscience, of the current *morale*. Here, again, behold us in a divorce, or rather, in a contradiction between thought and life, between the revolution of theory and the invitation to the routine or to the "conformism" of moral practice.

(4) The efforts of ancient stoicism at adaptation to present conditions, and its claims for the autonomy of the will, also seem profoundly deceptive to the experience. We have been told that succour was within us, inexhaustible, that to bend our will would suffice to lift us up to the greatest sacrifices, and that in it was our strength and our salvation. In difficult hours souls have felt all their weakness and they have sought about themselves anxiously for consolation. If the intellectual "solipsism" of which Leibniz spoke is a monster, the moral solipsism is an impossibility. With all our soul we seek without for a surplus of strength and a transcendent support for our wavering will. And by instinct we declare thus that our salvation is outside ourselves.

(5) Only a doctrine of love, a doctrine linked to action by its nature and which arouses action, a doctrine which engenders love, and, through love, the entire acceptation of difficult sacrifices, can respond to the imperious necessities of the present time. It constitutes the most urgent need of contemporary moral teaching.

Undoubtedly an impulse of generosity is capable of exalting in certain hours even the most commonplace beings; enthusiasm also knows how sometimes to inspire courage; love alone remains the inspirer of continued strength before prolonged duty. For only love has the powerful faculty of multiplying forces and of introducing joy into the sacrifice; it alone possesses the marvellous power of enthusing souls by its irresistible weight, of lightening their sorrows and putting in the heart, in the face of an immolation foreseen, something of the serenity of the heavens. First of all in our moral teaching it is important to introduce the love which has been expelled

from it, in turn, by Kantian rationalism, positivism, evolution, sociology, and laicity in all its forms.

(6) But love does not attain to its full expansion nor does its quality reach the height of its power if it does not proceed from a religion. Then the continuity of the succour which it brings, the transcendence of its power and of its joy, are explained by the transcendence of their origin—the communication of the sacred fire to the soul. The last attempts made in France to idealize Humanity or to make nature divine tend to give this character to duty and to arouse enthusiasm by means of love.

(7) Then, neither this respect, this enthusiasm, nor this love can be evoked except by a religion which places the individual in relation with a personal Being, capable of recognizing his suffering, hearing his prayer, and procuring aid for him. I need to know that my cry of supplication is not lost in the night and that it reaches an all-powerful Goodness. In order to accept fully all my obligations, that of death, if need be, I must know that there is for me *a Father Who is in Heaven.*

To all these disabled souls Christianity carries superabundance of light and of strength because it is, first of all, a doctrine of love.

This love it discloses from all eternity in the depths of the divine essence. If ancient wisdom could be uplifted to an affirmation of an infinite intelligence, it could not suspect that this intelligence, this infinite Good, was capable of love for the little and miserable world. This is the great revelation which Christianity brings to the earth. If God is Spirit and Light uncreated, He is also quite as much substantial Love. And it is love which explains creation. By a decree of sovereign goodness, God freely took creatures from nothingness in order to bestow upon them something of His ineffable perfections and to lead them to participation in His eternal felicity.

All is love in the gifts poured out by Him upon the first creatures. And when the revolt of man shall have introduced evil, sorrow, death, into the world, things excluded from the divine plan, Love will repair the disorder caused by human beings. And it is because He has so loved the world that God, says St. John, "has sent into the world His only Son to the end that in Him we have life".

And the Word made flesh continued in the Redemption this work of ineffable love. In the universality of this love, He offers, inexhaustibly, peace and salvation to all men of good will, to the humble as well as to the powerful in spirit, to Jews as well as to Gentiles, to the Barbarians as well as to the Greeks. From His birth until the end, love directs His life, inspires His teachings, gives rise to His miracles, up to the very moment when, His arms oustretched over a guilty humanity in a gesture of ineffable pardon and in the supreme sacrifice of love, He is raised up between that humanity and God to reconcile it with its Father.

And this work of love is continued through the centuries in the souls ransomed by His blood and vivified by His grace. Jesus dwells with us to the end of time to sustain the world by His Spirit and to direct the Church which He founded; He dwells indeed especially present among us in the sacrament of His love and this love leads Him even to unite with souls in a communion most intimate.

Under His inspiration the Catholic Church, the depositary of His love, promulgates the divine teachings from century to century. She denounces the evil, the discords, the hatreds, the injustice of the strong, of the powers of the world; she teaches love for the poor and respect for the small. A long time before Spinoza discovered that "men truly love themselves only in God", she had shown the great and sublime reason of human fraternity in the same divine Paternity of all beings.

In love, again, the Church through the centuries has laboured inexhaustibly to alleviate the ills of humanity. She desires that suffering, undeserved misery, moral shame, may diminish, and that souls shall increase in the dignity of their human and Christian condition, the respect for themselves and for others, in veneration of the truth, in the light of understanding and the peace of hearts. And if fratricidal war stains humanity, it is because in this humanity, minds proud and covetous, nations of prey, have forgotten the great message of Jesus: Love one another.

Because this divine love for souls awakens in souls the flame of the love of God, these discover throughout life, in suffering, and even before death, strength necessary for the acceptation of these things, and in the very sacrifices they taste the higher joys which sustain and console them. They know that the world is not governed by the inflexible destiny of eternal laws; that a Providence infinitely vigilant and infinitely gentle watches over beings, over all beings, even to the smallest, and even to the humblest details of their existences. They are certain that the tests now inexplicable have their beneficent justification, and that these, after all, contribute to their salvation. They understand that suffering remains the great law of the redemption of souls and that there is in the sacrifice accepted by love, a purifying virtue which expiates the past and prepares for the happiness of the future. They know, finally, in hours of weakness, when courage fails under the weight of sorrows, that prayer brings to them an increase of power, an inner vigour, of which they have consoling experience; and instead of hardening themselves with stoicism by an effort of their will and looking for their salvation in themselves alone, they ask with confidence of the mercy of God, and in that confession of their feebleness they discover the secret of their power.

And love brings, as did the consoling angel to the Man

of Sorrows, its appeasing balm. To the Christian who suffers in union with His Saviour, it repeats that nothing of his silent devotions and of his hours of agony is lost for eternity. And before the presentiment of death Christian faith shows to the humble soldier, whose heroism men will not know, the eternal recompense and the magnificent gift which leaves nothing without recompense which shall have been done for love of Him; it chants in his heart hopes of the life which ends not and, after a brief separation during which Providence continues his work of love about the hearth of mourning, of a positive reunion in the City of Peace with those who have loved one another in Christ.

Then, in the soul of the combatant who perhaps is soon to die, there arises before these lights and under the influence of this grace, a feeling sweet and powerful, an act of entire abandon, generous, confident, filial, to this Father who is in Heaven. And under the action of this grace which strengthens him, and in the mysterious sweetness of the peace which invades all his being, he who perhaps was in agony before the peril or who revolted under the suffering or was weighed down by despair, continues silently in his heart the prayer of love: *Thy will be done.*

Sanitation and Morality

By W. C. Gorgas,
Surgeon-General U. S. Army, Late Chief Sanitary Officer, Isthmian Canal Commission.

The present city of Panama is located on a peninsula extending out to Panama Bay from the foot of Ancon mountain. It was built there by edict of the Spanish King about 1672, and immediately after the destruction of old Panama by the English leader, Sir Henry Morgan. It rapidly grew in wealth and prosperity, and by the beginning of the eighteenth century had a considerably larger commerce than any other city in the western hemisphere.

After the revolt of the Spanish colonies from the mother country, in the early part of the nineteenth century, the prosperity of Panama rapidly decreased. Fitful prosperity returned with the building of the Panama railroad in 1855, and again with the attempted construction of a sea-level canal by the French in 1880, but when the Columbian Government turned down the treaty with the United States concerning canal construction at Panama, and the United States Government turned to Nicaragua as the place for canal construction, it seemed that the city of Panama was doomed, and would gradually disappear from the map.

But brighter times were near at hand. Panama seceded; made a treaty with the United States for the construction of the Canal at Panama, and work was begun by our Government in 1904.

In 1904, when we first went to Panama, the community was an exceedingly poor one of about 20,000 inhabitants.

It rapidly increased in wealth and population, and Panama is now a very prosperous city of some 65,000 inhabitants.

The Canal Zone consists of an area five miles on each side of the Canal, running from north to south some fifty miles in length. This area was practically ceded by the Republic of Panama to the United States. But at the south end of the Zone the Republic reserved to herself an area some five or six square miles in extent, in which was located the city of Panama.

Very early in our occupation in 1904 the lines delimiting the Panama area from our territory were located. The United States was very strict about allowing people to settle or build on our territory, and finally entirely forbade all settlement or building there; bought out the titles of all individuals who owned land in United States territory, and moved off of said lands all dwellers thereon. This in practice made an island some six square miles in size in which was located the city of Panama. While the inhabitant of the Panamanian capital could walk or drive or travel through our territory, he could not live there.

When we went to Panama in 1904, the buildings of the city occupied about one-quarter of the reservation described. Rents were very cheap, and accommodation, such as it was, easily obtained. When our working force was at its maximum we had on our rolls some 60,000 men. With their families and dependents this meant a population of more than 100,000 persons brought by us to the Isthmus. Many of these people had to live in the city of Panama, in order that they might have access to their work. Rents rapidly rose, and soon small rooms rented for six and eight dollars a month. This caused the city to be very much crowded, and living conditions became very unsanitary. These conditions would have readily corrected themselves if buildings could have been put up, for there was plenty of unoccupied land in the reservation at Panama, probably three-quarters of it being at

this time entirely unoccupied. This unoccupied land was owned by a few of the old families of Panama, who did not have the means to build. Land values were increasing by leaps and bounds. No one wanted to sell, because all could see that land values would very soon be very much higher than they were even then.

I was the Chief Health Officer of the city, and found myself confronted with the problem of an enormously congested town on the one hand, and a large unoccupied area on the other. The question was how to get these land owners either to put up more buildings themselves, or to sell their lands and let others do it. After much thought over the matter, and consultation with the city authorities, we decided that funds for the sanitation of Panama should be raised by a tax on land values. This we could see would force a considerable portion or all of these unused lands into use.

Take the head of one of the leading Panama families owning one square mile of this territory, who was too poor to build, and who was unwilling to sell even a small portion of his holdings because he knew that he would soon be able to command a very much higher price for these lands. If the city should now levy a sanitary tax of two cents on the dollar for the market value of his land, he would be obliged to sell a small portion so as to enable him to pay his taxes on the rest. The person buying his lands would at once build upon them, with the idea of getting rents, so that he could meet his taxes. The original land-owner, rather than part with all his holdings for the purpose of paying his taxes, would also put up some buildings. This would tend very rapidly to reduce overcrowding and react favourably in many other ways. The land-owners putting up these buildings would employ labour, buy supplies, and enter into many other activities which would tend to the general prosperity of the community.

We did not succeed in getting this measure through the Legislature, but had to meet our needs by other and very

much less perfect measures. I spent several years in thinking over this condition of unsanitary crowding, and was every day in contact with the people so unhappily affected. I was much in contact during these years with Archdeacon Bryan, who was deeply interested in the moral improvement of these same people. He had a deep insight into their character, and knew them, I think, better than anyone else on the Isthmus. In approaching the question from the moral side, as he did, I could see that he was as much hampered by crowding and poverty as I was on the sanitary side. Take a negro labourer with a wife and one or two children, living, sleeping, washing and cooking in a room 12 by 12. What can be expected of him in the way of personal hygiene! Suppose he should be well taught in hygiene according to modern methods, how could he carry it out? Suppose my friend the Archdeacon succeeded in teaching them morals and Christianity; how could this man and his wife, and children live up to these teachings with such poverty and surroundings? What could you or I do for ourselves and our dependents in the direction of either sanitation or morals if we lived with such surroundings, getting a sufficient wage for only a bare living, knowing that when either sickness or stoppage of work occurred even that miserable wage would stop?

As I have examined into conditions in other parts of the world, I have become convinced that Panama is no peculiar exception. All other cities of civilized countries, I can see, are affected in much the same way, from the same causes, and are open to the same remedies. We can teach morals and hygiene indefinitely, but we shall not be able to make any great advance until we can place our fellow men in such position that they can adopt our teachings.

It is evident to my mind that the great and insuperable clog to the advance of the Church in its teachings, and to the advance of the sanatarian in his teachings, is the

grinding poverty of the larger portion of our fellow countrymen. The only feasible way that I can see for in any way alleviating this poverty is by increasing wages.

Now wages are affected on the one hand by the number of persons competing for employment, and on the other hand, by the number of jobs we have for these persons. If the number of jobs is greater than the number of persons competing, wages will be high and will tend steadily to increase, until finally each man gets all he produces. Beyond this point wages cannot increase. If the number of persons seeking employment is greater than the number of jobs, wages will decrease, and continue to decrease to a point below which the labourer cannot go and maintain life.

That condition of wages in which he gets all he produces is known as natural wages, and the object of all social organization should be to give to all producers natural wages. All of us would automatically get natural wages unless some form of monopoly came in to deprive us of part of what we produced, without making us a just return.

I will not consider the question of decreasing the number of people applying for employment. No churchman or broad sanitarian would consider for a moment such measures, though they would be very easily brought about. Any sanitarian could spread such an epidemic of yellow fever in the United States that a million people could easily be killed off in the course of a year. Such a sanitary measure would greatly improve the condition of those who were left. Wages for several years would be higher, and living conditions, therefore, among the poorest, very much better. Europe is now trying this measure on a very large scale. When this war is over there will be many millions fewer persons in Europe competing for jobs than there were when it commenced, and there will be very many million dollars of wealth destroyed which will have to be replaced. This will mean that in

Europe, for several years to come, the jobs will be seeking the men, rather than the men the jobs. Wages will steadily increase, and the poverty of the poorest classes be much alleviated. Prosperity, I dare predict, will be very general.

Now let us turn to the other side, and see what we can do in the way of making the number of jobs more numerous than the number of applicants for these jobs. The present condition of having more men than we have jobs is modern and comparatively recent. Until comparatively recent times jobs were always so numerous that the only way in which one man could get what another man produced without giving him a fair return was to own him as a chattel slave. Until within the last few hundred years everywhere in civilized countries natural opportunities were so abundant and free that no man would work for another, but used some free natural opportunity where he could get all he produced. Chattel slavery probably originated for this reason; that where natural opportunities are free and abundant, the only way in which it is possible for the strong to take from the weak is for the strong to own the weak bodily. As far as the labourer is concerned, however, chattel slavery has this great advantage over our present labour system. Under our present system the labourers being more numerous than the jobs, the tendency is inevitable for wages gradually to decrease until they reach and pass below the starvation point. And in such a civilization as ours, the poorest class of labourers is constantly starving and disappearing from want and the other concomitants of extreme poverty. The people who are robbing them do not come in personal contact with the person suffering, and are not aware of the fact that they are robbing anybody. The tendency, therefore, is for the robber, or the master, or the employer, whatever you choose to call him, to take all the wealth he can without any reference to the necessity of the employee. With the chattel slave the master was

entirely aware exactly from what source his wealth was derived. He was in constant personal contact with the labourer. All his interests, sympathies and sense of justice impressed upon him the desirability of leaving the labourer enough of his produce to keep himself and family from want, and in good condition. We can pick out conditions other than those which involve chattel slavery where the jobs were more numerous than the applicants for them. Take America during the colonial period; any man who was not a chattel slave, if he thought his wages were too small, could strike in the most effective way. He could go a few miles into the wilderness, start his own farm and have as wages all he produced—natural wages. Any employer, therefore, who wished a man to work for him would have to pay him a little more than he could make by working for himself. This tended to keep up wages, and prevented the grinding proverty that we now see around us in all civilized communities.

For the first two hundred years of its settlement the United States had no tramp class, or any considerable population living at the edge of starvation.

Is it possible for us to reconstruct the economic conditions which existed during these first two hundred years? It seems to me that it is. Suppose that an area similar to the present Mississippi Valley, and just as rich and productive, should rise from the bottom of the Atlantic Ocean three or four hundred miles east of New York. The economic conditions of colonial times would at once be reconstructed. Every one in the United States who was dissatisfied with his condition would at once seek this new island, and wages in New York would rapidly rise until they came to be a little greater than the amount of wealth which a man could produce for himself in this new island.

Now there is a much greater island than this right at our doors. Not half of the present area of the United States is being productively used. Fifty-five per cent.

of the arable lands are at present held out of use. If we should adopt any scheme whereby this vast area of unused lands should be brought into use, exactly the same result would follow as to wages as would occur upon the rising from the sea of the island just referred to. It is easy enough to point out how these unused lands could be forced into use. Any system of taxation whereby land values were taxed to such an extent that it would be unprofitable to keep them unused would bring about this desirable condition. At present, such a discussion is more or less academic.

Chattel slavery has been abolished all over the world because it was perfectly obvious that the master was withholding from the slave a large part of the wealth the slave was producing, without making him any return. And to modern man this seemed unjust, though we must bear in mind that this to us perfectly obvious injustice did not appear unfair to our ancestors for the first six or seven thousand years of human history. It seemed perfectly natural and proper to them that the strong should take from the weak, and they did not hesitate to carry these views into practice on a most extensive scale. The industrial slavery of modern times is not near as obvious to us as chattel slavery was to our ancestors of a couple of generations ago, while to the labourer, the results of the present industrial slavery are much more harsh and cruel and morally degrading than was chattel slavery at any period of its existence. The master does not come in personal contact with the industrial slave, and therefore does not appreciate the suffering and moral degradation that is brought about by the system.

But education will surely change these conditions. A time is rapidly coming when we will appreciate the wrong and harshness of our present industrial slavery. It took our ancestors six thousand years to educate themselves up to the point of recognizing that chattel slavery was unjust. I believe that by the time the generation of

which I am a member shall have finished its work, the present industrial slavery will be looked upon as quite as unjust as we now look upon chattel slavery.

I appeal to you from the point of view of Christians to take part in all measures that tend toward increase of wages with the object of putting our fellowman in such position that he will be able to adopt the teachings and morals of Christianity. I urge upon you the consideration of the question as to whether or not the greatest and most efficient of all these measures is not such taxation of land values as will force into use all unused lands.

Theology from the Viewpoint of the Science of Religion

By Dr. George Wobbermin,
Professor of Systematic Theology in the University of Heidelberg.

The handling of the subject which heads this article requires the discussion of two introductory matters. We must first determine the position of theology in the general scheme of the sciences, and then the internal classification of theology must itself be made plain. In order to get our point of view as to the first question, the best way is to set out from the distinction between the special sciences and philosophy. For the conception of science is not exhausted in the sphere of the special sciences, and the total task of science is not completed by the special sciences. It is true that in the second half of the last century it was a widespread custom to affirm exactly what is here denied. This opinion was treated as the genuine modern point of view, in fact, the only scientific one. Positivism desired to get rid of philosophy altogether and limit the conception of science to the special sciences. But Positivism itself reduced this point of view to absurdity. For it became itself involved in philosophy, even in metaphysics, and so placed itself in a false position. Without a philosophy no system of science will work, because, in the first place, all the separate sciences use assumptions which are themselves not investigated by these sciences and can not be so tested; and, secondly, the special sciences lead to positions where the work involved passes outside the province of the special science itself.

The position of theology is at the very outset a peculiar one, because it is in one way a special science, with its specific scientific purpose, and, from another aspect, it is related to philosophy as the inclusive total science. This last is the case for this reason; theology in its own domain leads up to the final and highest questions, *i.e.* to questions dealing with the ground and the final end of being. It is not possible for the task of philosophy to be completed within the limits of the special sciences. Theology must necessarily be closely related in a special sense with philosophy. Yet nevertheless theology is also a special science. It has a definite special sphere of human life to investigate and valuate. This sphere concerns religion, in its characteristics, in its specific essence. The chief danger to be avoided by theology is the rationalizing of religion. To rationalize religion is nothing more than to bring religion into servitude; in its ultimate resort it means doing away with religion. Primarily, therefore, religion is a special science.

The question then arises immediately: where can we find within the limits of the special sciences the appropriate place for theology? In what order or relationship are special sciences to be arranged? The most popular and widespread conception of today accepts the distinction between natural and intellectual sciences, or sciences of nature and of mind. So theology must plainly be placed in the category of the intellectual sciences, and, from the standpoint of method, theology must be governed in its work by the principles of the sciences of the mind. This position is represented in a fundamental way, chiefly by Dilthey and Wundt, in discussions relating to the theoretical basis of science. These two must be regarded as the leading and typical representatives of this whole point of view. But, after all, this point of view is confronted with serious difficulties, with questionings relating to really fundamental principles that are of decisive importance in testing the rules of method. H. Rickert can

claim the merit, in his great work on the limits of the concepts of natural science, of having brought up in orderly form these objections. The distinction between natural and intellectual sciences, insofar at least as it is formulated in a distinct analysis of methods, is obviously founded on the distinction between the physical and the psychic. The sciences of the mind require as their foundation a general psychology of these sciences. But this resultant of the point of view just mentioned is open itself to serious objections. How, we must ask, can such a general psychology of the sciences of the mind be attained? In spite of the valuable work done by Wundt and Dilthey, this point is left altogether vague. But the objections are not yet exhausted. The distinction between the spheres of the physical and the psychic is itself problematical. The physical is intelligible only through the mediation of the psychic factor; in other words, by consciousness. To this extent the physical is subordinated to and included in the psychic, and the bringing of the spheres of the physical and the psychic into a parallel position appears a superficial juxtaposition, or, in any case, it is not a satisfactory one.

We are, therefore, confronted with the task of making another system of classification. The obvious point of departure is the close relationship of the natural sciences, a point that is perfectly apparent in all scientific operations. Studies belonging to natural science and those not so belonging, such in any case is the division. We must only enquire: under what common aspect can the natural sciences be brought? and under what common aspect, the studies not belonging to natural science? Such questions as these have been, in the last decade, frequently discussed with a thoroughness that takes its origin from Rickert's work, already referred to above.

Rickert takes up as a matter of primary importance the question whether the cultural sciences are to be set over against the natural sciences. This means that we

must not distinguish between the sciences of nature and of mind, but between natural and cultural sciences. The result is that the concept of culture or social progress must be decisive when we consider the methodological structure of studies not belonging to natural science; the concept of a soul process or a psychic factor must not be placed in opposition to the physical factor. So far, I submit, Rickert is absolutely correct. To have attained to this vital degree of insight is his chief merit. Cultural life, speaking more accurately, the cultural life in its historical shape, is assuredly the common principle of the studies that do not belong to natural science. The historic factor, *i.e.*, history, has as a consequence of this point of view a primary place, an essential position in the studies that are not a part of physical science. Culture and history belong together; instead of cultural sciences, one can say just as well historical sciences. Yet the expression, cultural sciences, is preferable since the concept—historical sciences—will lead to a new difficulty. For this expression, the idea associated with it, will awaken the impression that cultural sciences are concerned merely with historical interests and therefore with purely historical work. This is entirely and absolutely untrue. The cultural sciences are differentiated, I assert, according to the different cultural values with which they have to do. These different cultural values are of decisive importance—Language, Art, Political Life, etc. The value-relation, in other words, the relation to a definite value, is the essential factor in the cultural sciences. All of these values are intimately connected with history, and, insofar as this is true and in this sense, they are historic factors. But they are not really historic factors in the sense that historic research alone is sufficient in dealing with them, or that historic research, by itself and in isolation, can be left to say the last word on these particular values. No, these values must not merely be investigated and treated in reference to their historical

development, but also in relation to their proper value factors. It is not sufficient to ask: What are the characteristics of the previous transitions of these values? We must ask further: What is the actual relation of these values, what about the existence of these values as a whole? What are we to say of the valuation which expresses itself in these values? All reference to value refers back to some valuation. Historical research has directly to do in every case with a value-relation only. Yet this sphere of value must itself be investigated. In this way the special sciences of value, or the cultural sciences, are naturally connected in historical work, on the one hand, and in systematic, on the other. The same thing is true of theology. It has as its "value-object" religion, more specifically, Christianity, as a subject to be investigated; first, from the point of view of its origin and development; then, from the point of view of its absolute value *per se*. Historic and systematic theology are, we see, the chief main divisions of theological study; to them must be added, as a third division, practical theology, which presupposes both, and brings them into relationship with the practices of church life. Still, practical theology does not stand simply on a line or on a level with both the other two, *i.e.*, historical and systematic theology. It is an addition to them. Historical and systematic theology, on the contrary, as a result of their subject-matter, are closely co-ordinated; they mutually condition and supplement one another.

From two sides this co-ordinated relationship has been brought into confusion recently. First, it is maintained that historic theology has a place by itself; it, and it alone, is competent to undertake scientific theological work. Systematic theology is a natural part of practical theology. But this assertion plainly rests on a one-sided and exaggerated claim for historical study, on an overestimation of the capacity of historical research. Historical research can only, in any and every case, throw

light on the value-relation involved; but every such relation implies a pre-existent valuation, and in regard to the value-factor itself history can claim no final decision. The other way in which confusion has been introduced is due to the assertion that systematic and practical theology, being opposed to historical theology, belong essentially together. The whole subject-matter of theology is, we are told, to be divided into historical theology, on the one hand, and normative theology, on the other. To this last certainly belong systematic and practical theology. Now this view also is inaccurate and misleading. It is based on a *non sequitur*, on a four-term syllogism. It uses the term "normative" in a double sense. Systematic and practical theology can only be characterized as normative studies by means of an entirely different use of language. For in practical theology one is concerned with normative rules in the sense of technical rules. Systematic theology has nothing to do with such rules. It has only to do with the subject-matter itself, with the valuation of the object of theological work, a valuation which in all historical research done by theology is taken for granted.

On this foundation we can approach the discussion of the question regarding the relation of theology and the science of religion. Is the task of theology in itself fundamentally to be regarded as belonging to the science of religion, to be treated consistently as such, or not? That the total view of which I have spoken already tends in this direction to affirm the query is undoubtedly true. As a value of the type that in the whole sphere of the sciences constitutes a particular cultural science, religion as a whole is in the first instance to be so regarded. Only afterwards are the further differentiations to be outlined, and the question raised as to the gradations of value. Just as certainly as such a differentiation of value is not excluded but rather is involved in the whole discussion and required by it, so certainly is the fundamental treat-

ment of the question of the science of religion concerned in the result of this position. And at this point we must reach the decisive question: How is the proper interest of theology in this point of view to be determined? Is this principle to be maintained, or must theology reject it and seek for some other general theology of science, some other system of science?

The attitude towards this question I propose to discuss initially in respect to two definitions of the meaning and task of theology, both of which have attained fame in the history of theological science. First, let us take the old dogmatic position, the one which traditional Protestant theology took over from scholasticism, and afterwards presented from its own point of view. Theology is here treated as the science of God and of divine things, *doctrina de deo et rebus divinis*. This definition did not merely originate in scholasticism, which inherited it from antiquity, but it is in essential harmony with scholasticism. This fact shows most plainly the distinction to which the definition gives rise, and on which the old Protestant theologians also laid especial emphasis—the distinction between an original and a derived theology. The original theology (*theologia archetypa*) is the theology whose subject is God Himself, *i.e.* the doctrine or knowledge which God has concerning Himself (*doctrina* or *cognitio quam deus de se ipso habet*); derivative theology (*theologia ectypa*) is the theology which men create. This latter, however, is only the copy and shadow of that proper and primary theology already mentioned. In this distinction, I claim, appears clearly the scholastic character of the above definition. It is really scholastic; and it is therefore to be rejected, like all scholasticism, in the name of critical thought as well as in the name of religion. God and divine things are not the object of human thought and knowledge, and can not be so. Even if it were so to any degree, religious belief, in any case, especially evangelical Christian belief, has nothing in common with such

knowledge. For its conviction as to God and divine things is a conviction of faith, and it purposes to be and must be a conviction of faith. It should not therefore be transformed into knowledge of the intellectual type nor confused with it. Both would mean a rationalizing of religion. Rationalizing religion is the same thing as bringing religion into servitude; it is nothing more, as we have already asserted, than doing away with religion. The evangelical conception of faith is precisely the thing which makes that old definition of faith obsolete.

We know also that Schleiermacher, the man who desired to place theological work absolutely on the basis of the evangelical faith-concept and has done so, even partly rejected that definition as a matter of principle, and by so doing prepared the way for the conception of theology as the science of religion. For him, theology is not the science of God but the science of belief in God, of the faith-relationship to God; and this alone harmonizes with the principles of the Reformation. Luther declared with the strongest emphasis that God and faith go together, are "part of the same heap", are to be joined by one link. If this is true, then it is also true that theology cannot be considered and treated as the science of God, but of belief in God, of the faith-relation to God. This view of the subject attained by Schleiermacher cannot be weakened by the latest attempt to discredit it. Such an attempt has, indeed, been made recently by Er. Schäder with his programme of a theocentric theology. While Schäder is preparing this programme of a theocentric theology and is expressly offering it in opposition to the whole method of theological thought inaugurated by Schleiermacher, in doing so he returns to the old definition of theology as the doctrine of God and divine things; but this means also the abandoning of the position of the Reformation. We must, indeed, recognize that in the detailed exposition of his programme Schäder has established various correct points of view, but, taken as a

whole and as a principle, his programme represents scholasticism. The alternative which he desires to establish —a theocentric or anthropocentric theology—is, according to evangelical theology, not an acceptable alternative. Theology should not be theocentric or anthropocentric; it must be both of these at once—anthropocentric in its methodological point of approach, theocentric in its aim. It must, therefore, be the science of belief in God, beginning from a faith-relationship to God.

Though Schleiermacher is shown to be right and though he has on his part developed the conception of theology as the science of religion, yet he has not carried this to its complete expression. Schleiermacher has, we must allow, been the cause of preventing the conception of theology as the science of religion from being taken seriously by the generations that come after him. He has done this because of his celebrated definition of theology which he set forth in his *Short Sketch of Theological Study*, for this definition has in a later period been applied to and used against the standpoint of theology as a science of religion. Of course Schleiermacher did not prevent such an application. In itself this definition does not necessarily lead to such a development and application, indeed, the main tendency of Schleiermacher excludes such an application.

Scheiermacher's definition: "Theology is the résumé of those scientific acquirements and rules, without the possession and use of which a harmonious direction of the Christian Church *i.e.* a Christian church order is not possible"—this, I say, in Schleiermacher's own intention, deals with theology as the science of a faculty pertaining to university instruction; that is, when we think of theology as a subject of teaching as it belongs to the organism of a university which is not exclusively an institution of learning but also serves practical purposes. This description of its content Schleiermacher indicated, however, by means of the crude and misleading terminology of a positive

science. A positive science must be of such a kind that its separate elements are associated not from actual internal reason, but only because of external opportunistic reasons (since they are required by a practical purpose). This crude conception of a positive science rests on a doubly mistaken appreciation of the essentials of science. It contains at once an improper preliminary limitation and also an improper expansion of the conception of science. On the one hand and in the last resort, every science has a practical aim; it serves real life, it promotes life and enriches it. The idea that science is pursued purely for its own sake is an illusion proceeding from a misunderstanding of the true character of man and his history. Moreover, the significance of science is absolutely destroyed if the sphere of science is determined, not according to its own principles, but according to definite external and empirical aims and opportunistic considerations. Schleiermacher had in mind the idea of a practical science, *i.e.*, a science which has direct connection with a definite sphere of life and education. Such practical sciences, therefore, if they are to be reckoned at all properly as sciences, must be founded on pure or theoretical sciences. In this sense the sciences taught in university faculties are practical sciences. This in former days was true of the so-called superior faculties: in our own day it is equally true of the separate classes of studies in the philosophical faculty. When one refers to the practical character of a science the question is raised at the same time as to the pure science on which it is founded,—raised, I submit, but not settled.

If we expand it by this closer analysis, the definition of Schleiermacher is free from objection. It justifies and authorizes the reference to the Church. Without this closer analysis the definition of Schleiermacher tends to a limiting and externalizing position, This is nothing more than giving a Catholic content to the conception of Schleiermacher, in itself strictly Evangelical.

As to the direction in which the establishing of theology as a practical or pedagogical science is to be looked for, this point is suggested at least by Schleiermacher. He indicates in the introduction to his *Short Sketch* the type of theology that requires definition as Christian theology, and allows its different parts to be connected by the common reference to a definite religion. In this way a point of view connected essentially with the science of religion is asserted. This accordingly implies that the task of theology, owing to the variety of religions, must be approached from different avenues. For the time being a definite religion must afford the basis, but this must be treated as religion in the sense that its relation to the other religions, to everything which is called or should be called religion, must be considered. This means that it must be treated from the point of view of the science of religion; all of which implies that it must be examined and discussed as a part of the science of religion.

Christian theology, it is evident, is the science of the Christian religion in its significance for religious life generally; only in this respect is the science of the Christian religion an independent science. If we designate briefly Christian theology as *the* theology, this is only the result of the conviction that the Christian religion is the culmination and apex of all religious life. But it is just this claim of the Christian religion that must be itself submitted to scientific examination. And this statement is only another way of saying that the Christian religion is ultimately to be treated according to the methods of the science of religion.

It is not true that this conception of the aim of theology answers alone the interest of science, but leaves out of account the interests of the Christian religion; rather, the interests of the Christian religion lead also to the same result. This assertion can best be shown by testing the objections that are urged against the position taken by theology as the science of religion. Such objections are

urged from three points of view, but as a matter of fact these three points are not effective against theology as the science of religion, but rather are in favour of it. We submit that as soon as these three points of view are understood in their completeness, they will be seen to support the treatment of theology as the science of religion.

These three points are the allocation of theology as a Bible science, as the teaching of revelation, and as a science of the Church. As a science of the Bible, theology cannot really be prosecuted without causing the Bible religion to be subjected to the analysis of religion. Whether or not the New Testament directly and initially demands the application to it of the science of religion (in accordance with the view of Bousset, Gunkel and others), may be a matter left aside, because in any case the Old Testament requires such an application by reason of the many points of contact which it makes plain between the religion set forth by it and the religions of the neighbouring peoples, and also because of the manifold forms and degrees of the religious life that are brought to view in it. It has been said, it is true, that the fragment of religious life presented in the Old Testament is "a substitute for religious history in its whole extent". But this claim rests upon an illusion, for the Old Testament can be this kind of a substitute only after it is investigated and understood from the standpoint of the science of religion. There is therefore a mutual relation required between the study of the Old Testament and that of other religions.

The same holds good in regard to the objection based on revelation. Theology must be regarded as a study of revelation because the Christian religion bases upon the revelation of God all that it offers to mankind, and stands or falls with the assertion that the revelation of God in Christ Jesus can alone secure the certainty of eternal salvation for mankind. Yet the idea of revelation

in the New Testament leads to the point of view of the science of religion by a direct road; it does so inasmuch as it also recognizes examples of the revelation of God among the heathen. But far more important is the further point: according to the general view of the New Testament it is possible to enter into relation with God only on the ground of the divine revelation; therefore, only on the ground that God on His side, in the first place, prepares such a relation. From this aspect religion and revelation are correlative terms. If this is true, it means that when we talk of religion, we speak of revelation; and therefore we are bound to ask in reference to all the phenomena which are wont to be treated in the name of religion, whether they should be so designated. The question as to the relation of Christianity to other religions receives in this way its most definitely formulated expression. It has, too, a significance of the most fundamental kind. To handle this question in a scientific way is plainly a fundamental condition for the science of Christianity.

The objection based on the ecclesiastical content of theology is, in a way, of the same character. Theology as the science of the Church has a necessary interest in the method used by the science of religion. Interest in the Church, if rightly understood, leads to interest in the science of religion. That interest in the Church is essential to theology is assuredly the kernel of the above-quoted definition of Schleiermacher. We must note in passing that Schleiermacher uses the term "Church" simply to indicate the community of religious people, the whole community of the religious-minded. Presuppositions of any kind with regard to the distinct organization-forms of such a community are not included in what Schleiermacher had in mind. By his reference to the Church Schleiermacher meant that theology must study religion in its concrete, living forms, and not confine religion to its intellectual constructions and previously prepared

categories. No, it should study living religion, religion as it is found in religious communities, *i.e.* in the churches. An especial interest in a particular single community is easily explicable in itself, but even in reference to this community full liberty of criticism in regard to its distinctive form must be asserted. The Church is here considered as the common bond of religiously minded people, as the community of the pious—put briefly, as Schleiermacher expressed it, the religious association. Therefore it must be discussed in its relation to other religious communities. Here again the trend towards the science of religion is not only possible but directly necessary. The main demand of Schleiermacher must, we think, be maintained, indeed, it must be pressed further and more consistently than it was possible for Schleiermacher to do. All attempts to go behind Schleiermacher's position by any circuitous route or to narrow his theological position must be rejected. This holds good even with regard to such a view as that suggested by Harnack that Western Catholicism is a substitute for the whole history of religion, because it is both summarized and unified in it, since from a succession in time there results a contiguity of position. The same thing is true of this argument, however, as of that noted previously in regard to the Old Testament; the claim here approved of implies as its presupposition the point of view of the science of religion. The view adopted here by Harnack in his estimate of Catholicism is properly only to be adhered to on the basis of the standpoint of the study of religion. It is hardly an accident, therefore, that Catholicism rejects absolutely the point of view and method of thought in harmony with the science of religion. But for the same reason that impels Catholicism to do this—it appears in its most concrete form in the dogma of Infallibility—Evangelical theology must with equal decisiveness range itself upon this very platform.

The Kantian Philosophy and Christian Theology

By George W. Richards, D.D.,
Professor of Church History, Theological Seminary of the Reformed Church in the United States.

In the treatment of this subject we shall consider four points: (1) the Function of Theology; (2) the Relation of Philosophy to Theology; (3) Distinctive Principles of the Kantian Philosophy; (4) the Theological Influence of the Kantian Philosophy.

1. The Function of Theology

At this time it is not necessary to define at length the difference between theology and religion—a distinction which our fathers have made and which has become our heritage. We clearly understand that theology is no more the source of religion than psychology is the spring of mental action. Religion furnishes the data of theology, which seeks in turn to give the Christian a rational statement of the contents of his faith, useful for preaching, teaching, and evangelizing. The Christian faith is rooted in a life related to God, man, and the world, begotten and determined by the gospel of Jesus Christ. The reality and the certainty of the Christian life are, therefore, not dependent on doctrinal statements, but doctrinal statements are the necessary outcome of intelligent analysis and definition of the ultimate realities and relations of the life of faith. Religion without theology would be spineless; theology without the experience of religion

would be heartless. Each is necessary for the completion of the other.

Theology also aims to show the relation of the objects of Christian faith to the culture of an age—its science, art, philosophy, politics, and religion, and how the doctrines and ideals of the gospel agree with, and differ from, contemporary views of the world and of life. Thus the beginnings of Christian theology are found in primitive Christianity when the disciples were compelled to prove to their kinsmen that Jesus was Messiah and Lord though he died condemned of men and apparently forsaken of God. Paul also defined the relation of the gospel to the Jewish law and to the Gentile world and described the cosmic, the historical, and the soteriological significance of Christ. A little later the apologists had to differentiate the gospel from the religions and the philosophies of the Greco-Roman world and to vindicate its superiority over all the products of pagan civilization. From Athanasius to Ritschl theologians have endeavoured both to define the gospel and the Christian life in terms of their age and to defend its claims in the face of a diversity of creeds and cults, occidental and oriental.

Furthermore, while it is conceded that theology cannot demonstrate the truth of Christian faith, the dogmatician must none the less show that the several articles of faith, the universally accepted truths of the Christian religion, are not in contradiction to well authenticated and generally received results of science and conclusions of philosophy. In other words, it is to be made clear that faith and the knowledge that comes through faith are as necessary and legitimate a part of man's normal life as the facts and principles which are reached by scientific observation and philosophic reflection. To illustrate by a single example, personal immortality is a fundamental article of faith. It cannot be proved by logical argument or by scientific observation. Its ground of certainty is in the unique character and the distinctive value of the re-

ligious and ethical life. Yet it can be shown that there are no valid results of science which make immortality unreasonable and incredible. Such, indeed, would not be the case if we should grant the claims of materialism which resolves the spiritual life of man into an efflorescence of physical forces. Or if we should accept the thesis of a current psychology, that the psychic life is only a stream of consciousness, a succession of nerve vibrations, without a fixed and dominating ego or personality; then, too, immortality would turn into an iridescent dream.

2. THE RELATION OF PHILOSOPHY TO THEOLOGY

If we have rightly defined the function of theology, it goes without saying that philosophy is its handmaid. It has formal value for a systematic statement of religious truth. Clear distinctions must be made as to the points of agreement and of difference between religious and philosophic views of God and the world. "In other words", says Mr. Moberly, "Religion must make terms with Philosophy; for Philosophy is only the most careful and accurate form of the relation of those beliefs." In Christian apologetics philosophy may be as valuable an ally as it may be an obstinate foe.

Notwithstanding, there have been devout men in every age of the Church who have ignored, distrusted, or opposed the introduction of philosophy into Christianity. Clement of Alexandria speaks of Christians of his day, the third century, who feared philosophy as children feared a wolf. Even scholars of unrivalled philosophic minds, like Schleiermacher and Ritschl, have denied that religion in its origin and spread is at all dependent on philosophy. There is even something unphilosophical in religion, and its great founders were anything but philosophers. These men have stood for the simplicity of the gospel, a layman's religion, the pure milk of the Word unmixed with the world's wisdom.

The suspicion with which philosophy in alliance with religion has been regarded is by no means groundless. For too often philosophy ceased to be the handmaid of theology and became its mistress. The objective verities of the gospel were supplanted by philosophical speculations. The Logos bulked so large that it eclipsed Jesus. Plato and Aristotle usurped the place of Matthew and Paul. The gospel was turned into a philosophy. Instead of Christianizing the Hellenes, Christianity was hellenized. Gnosticism was an acute hellenization of the gospel; which, unless it had been checked, would have ruined the Church. But men of modern mind have reiterated the gnostic ideal. Hegel considered philosophy the highest form of religion for the cultured classes, while the types and symbols of the gospel were a necessary adaptation of religion to the undeveloped mind of the masses. When Dr. Philip Schaff called on Frau Hegel, after Hegel's death, he inquired whether Hegel even went to Church. She replied, "*Nein, er sagte, 'Das Denken ist auch ein Gottesdienst.'* "

While it is doubtless true that even orthodoxy may have entered into questionable compromise with Aristotle, and Luther may have been justified in renouncing "*den vermaledeieten Heide, Aristotles*", the nature of Christianity, as well as the constitution of the human mind, will not permit the Church to ignore philosophy. For the revelations of religion must be brought into vital union with the ripe thoughts of men on the ultimate realities of life. "To tell a thinking man", says Aubrey Moore in *Lux Mundi*, "that he need not interpret to his reason what religion tells him of God is like saying to him, 'Be religious if you will, but you need not let your religion influence your conduct.' " There is room for an Origen at Alexandria in the second century and for a Troeltsch at Heidelberg in the twentieth. The evangelist and the theologian need not be antagonists; they ought to be coworkers with God in Christ Jesus.

That philosophy and religion may be properly mated in theology, it is necessary to define the relation between reason, the organ of philosophy, and faith, the organ of religion. What is the scope and what the limitation of each? In the history of theology the relation between reason and faith has been defined in three ways, namely the rationalistic, the semi-rationalistic, and the irrationalistic.

According to rationalism the reason is capable of evolving a system of absolute truth which has the value of a religious faith. The truths of religion and the conclusions of the reason are commensurate. Apart from reason there is no other source of truth. This was the view of Plato and Aristotle; in principle of all Greek philosophers. The English rationalists of the eighteenth century and the German idealists, Fichte and Hegel, shared this theory.

Semi-rationalism concedes the necessity of revealed truth, which, however, is not *contra rationem* but *supra rationem*. The basal ideas of religion, the existence of God, the creation of the world, the moral responsibility of man, a future life, may be comprehended and demonstrated by the reason. The soteriological truths, however, incarnation, atonement, resurrection, trinity, transcend the scope of the reason and must be accepted by faith. There is, accordingly, a natural theology and a revealed theology; the two are related as foundation and super-structure. This was the position of Thomas Aquinas and of the Catholic Church, as well as of the supernaturalistic orthodoxy of the Protestant Churches. The dogmatic philosophies of Descartes, Locke, Leibniz, and Wolff were also based on these premises. St. Thomas became the authoritative theologian of Catholicism because he fused Christian dogma and Greek philosophy in its Aristotelian form into an infallible system, so that reason buttressed faith and faith confirmed and completed reason. In principle, in spite of the protest of the Reformers, the

Protestant theologians reverted to the position of Aquinas, and orthodoxy to this day has not gone beyond it.

Irrationalism assumes that the reason is confined in its scope to the sphere of empirical phenomena. It is incapable of knowing God and things divine. Religion, therefore, is based, not partly on reason and partly on revelation, but on revelation alone. This was the position of the nominalists, Duns Scotus, Occam, and Biel; of the Reformers, Luther and Calvin, and of the philosopher, Immanuel Kant.

To understand Kant's influence on theology, we shall have to consider the relation of his philosophy to the ideals of Protestantism. In its origin and essence Protestantism is irrationalistic just as it is anti-Pelagian. Pelagius denied the sole efficacy of the grace of God, and Aristotle denied the sole sufficiency of the Word of God. Both exalted the human factor, the one the will, the other the reason, so as to minimize the divine factor in the Christian life. Luther, therefore, was equally hostile to the Irish monk and to the Greek philosopher. For Luther was convinced that the human mind can no more know God than the human will can please God. He left no room for the natural theology or for the natural ethics of semi-rationalistic Catholicism or of super-naturalistic Protestantism. The counter-part of his *sola fides* was the *solum verbum*. Faith finds its object only in the revealed word of God and not in the speculations of men. The function of philosophy in religion is purely formal, *i.e.*, to aid in finding the actual sense of revelation and to state in a logical way the substance of revelation. To prove revealed truth is neither possible nor necessary, not possible because reason cannot reach into the sphere of revelation, not necessary because the fact that truth is revealed is sufficient proof of its veracity. To compromise between grace and works, on the one hand, and faith and reason, on the other, is to undervalue the grace of God and to betray the word of God. From Luther's point of

view Aristotle was, indeed, a "damned heathen", and Pelagius a cursed heretic. For the one corrupted God's truth and the other denied God's grace.

Away, then, cried Luther, with your philosophical theology, vainly speculating about the existence and nature of God, and his relation to the world, with your rational religions and your rational ethics which obstruct the vision of faith in the revelation of God in Jesus. For all that faith needs, the mercy and grace of God, is revealed in Christ. This was a magnificent simplification of Christianity and a deliverance of the gospel from the burden of philosophical speculations and the sophistry of the schools. It was a return to the original message of Jesus and the apostles, who came not with a dogmatic system but with an invitation to the blessings of the kingdom of God. In speaking of the Reformation, Professor Harnack says: "Dogmatic Christianity is abolished and the new evangelical conception of religion has taken its place."

But, in spite of the new vantage ground of the evangelical Reformers, their followers were led captive by mediaeval scholasticism. Aristotle could not be dethroned in a day or a decade. Though the semi-rationalism of St. Thomas was temporarily checked in sixteenth century Catholicism, the Jesuits became reactionists, and since the publication of the encyclical *Aeterni Patris* in 1879, the theology and philosophy of Aquinas have become the standards of the Roman Church and are taught in all the Catholic schools.

Protestant theology, in its earliest form, shows traces of Aristotelian influence. True, Melanchthon banished philosophy from his first edition of the *Loci*, admitting only religious truth which came by revelation and was appropriated by faith. "This is to know Christ", he writes, "to know his benefits, not what these sophists teach, his natures and the mode of his incarnation." In his later editions he entered into an alliance with Aris-

totle, and added *loci* on the nature of God, the origin of sin, and the person of Christ, all of which were based on philosophical speculation, and not on divine revelation. The objects of faith, which the heart alone can comprehend, were converted into doctrinal propositions which the reason alone can understand. Even Luther never fully understood the theological implications of his new experience of salvation. For he always considered the ancient dogmas, though proceeding from a soteriology wholly different from his own, as an appropriate expression of evangelical faith. The necessity of differentiating the distinctive tenets of the different Churches, which came in the wake of the Reformation, gave occasion for resolving faith into dogma and of making doctrinal purity the criterion of sound Christianity. Thus we find a recrudescence of scholasticism, with all its subtle sophistry, in the evangelical Churches.

The theology of this type is fitly called rationalistic supernaturalism, a half-way covenant between orthodoxy and rationalism. It was supernaturalistic because the divine element in religion was emphasized to the neglect of the human and was held apart from organic union with the world's life. It was rationalistic because the proof of the Christian revelation was based, not on the *testimonium spiritus sancti*, a favorite appeal of the Reformers, nor even on the self-authenticating power of the word, but on logical argument or on historical investigation. In the words of Doctor Nevin, "Reason in its own natural form was supposed to be the only medium of assurance for us that the Bible is of divine authority, and the reason is the only instrument whereby we are to arrive at a knowledge of what the Bible teaches." Philosophy, therefore, was to confirm faith in revelation as was attempted by Wolff in Germany and Locke in England. From quite unexpected sources orthodoxy was warned against putting its trust in reason. Hume said, toward the close of his *Essay on Miracles* (1748): "Our most holy religion is

founded on faith, not on reason, and it is a sure method of exposing it to put it to such trial as it is by no means fitted to endure." A century later Heine wrote: "The instant when a religion seeks support from philosophy its ruin is inevitable. Religion like every other absolutism should be above proof."

In their point of view and method of study the orthodox and the rationalists, the Calvinists and the Arminians, the Trinitarians and the Unitarians, the Churchmen and the Evangelicals of the eighteenth century agreed. While they differed in many of their conclusions, their view of the world and of the Bible, their exegetical method and their theory of knowledge were essentially the same. Sabatier in his *Religions of Authority and the Religion of the Spirit* says:

> "Reimarus, Voltaire, and Tindal (all of them vulgar rationalists) had no other idea of religion than Quenstedt or Calovius (ardent supernaturalists). But to all men of that age the Christian religion was a supernatural science, a system of doctrine which some held to be true and others false. As the former explained it by a hypothesis of divine intervention, the latter always found it possible to attribute it to clerical trickery, and this they did not fail to do."

The consciousness of the modern man, begotten by a diversity of new forces,—religious, political, scientific, and philosophical,—could no longer be satisfied with the dogmas of orthodoxy, the conclusions of rationalism, and the sentimentalism of pietism. Nothing less than a rejuvenation and a readjustment of theology to a new age was required. For both Catholic and Protestant doctrine was based on a view of the world and of life that was outlived.

The change from the geocentric to the heliocentric view of the world had far-reaching consequences. The system which put the earth at the center of the universe, the Church at the center of humanity, hell under the earth, heaven above it, and the throne of God surrounded by a celestial hierarchy in the heaven of heavens, was dissolved into thin air by the discoveries of Copernicus,

Newton, and Kepler. Descartes reasoned from man to God, and Bacon from facts to principles—both equally anti-dogmatic and anti-traditional. The scientific method was applied first in the investigation of nature, then in the study of literature and history, and finally in the interpretation of religion and the Bible. The reign of miracle was superseded by a reign of law; God enthroned in the heavens was now regarded as dwelling in His world; revelation from above was turned into revelation from within. Philosophy, science, art, and politics, which, since the age of Constantine, were under the tutelage of the Church, declared themselves independent and followed the guidance of reason instead of revelation. Political and social sanctions were found in the reason and conscience of men, and not in the prescriptions of the Church or the precepts of the Bible.

Thus the warfare between theology and science began. For a time, indeed, the humanists and dogmaticians might ignore each other, but the modern man was unwilling to separate indefinitely his religion and his culture. The scientific and the democratic spirit demanded a reconstruction of theological doctrines in conformity with a new civilization. With all its defects the Enlightenment had rendered valuable service to the cause of religion. Henceforth account had to be taken by the Church of the legitimate claims of the individual reason and conscience over against the established authority of Church and State, of the legitimacy of criticism over against dogmatism, of free investigation over against implicit faith, of the cry for new forms of life corresponding to the new experience of a new age. Dorner says: "An antiquated theology went down to its grave but the Christian faith remained, nay, was even now reviving with fresh vigour to bring forth in due time a new theology."

A satisfactory reconstruction of theology had to be more than a revision of the traditional system by omission

of clauses and addition of phrases, by the breaking in of a new window here and the closing up of an old door there. The whole structure had to be rebuilt, in which, however, the essential material of the old gospel would be inwrought. To conserve the truths of orthodoxy and to appropriate the incontestable results of science and philosophy, of rationalism and pietism, criticism and historical research, at least the following eight factors had to be dealt with: (1) A new *Welt-Anschauung;* (2) a new *Lebens-Anschauung;* (3) a new theory of knowledge; (4) a new conception of man's origin and history; (5) a new definition of religion; (6) a new view of the origin and purpose of the Bible; (7) a new criterion of truth; (8) a new interpretation of Christ and of Christianity. I grant you this is not an easy task; but it is the problem with which the theologians of two continents have been wrestling more or less successfully since the eighteenth century.

3. DISTINCTIVE PRINCIPLES OF THE KANTIAN PHILOSOPHY

What part did Kant play in Modern Theology? At this point I shall have to guard myself against the snare of defining the Kantian philosophy in its relation to the history of philosophy. That, I fear, would stretch to the breaking-point my ability and your patience. I shall, therefore, only cite those principles of the critical philosophy which have had a direct bearing on theology.

To Kant the world is indebted for an exhaustive analysis of the powers of the human mind. He turned his attention from the objects of knowledge to the organ of knowledge. In his three critiques of Pure Reason, of Practical Reason, and of Judgment, he investigated and defined the scope and the limits of the human mind; in other words, what we can know and what we cannot know. His purpose was, as he says in one of his letters, to find an indestructible foundation for practical philosophy, *i.e.*, "the method of educating and ruling mankind and a basis

for exact natural science". In two statements in the *Critique of Pure Reason*, he summarizes his epoch-making theory of knowledge. First, "The understanding does not derive its laws from nature; but it imposes them upon nature"; second, "All human recognition begins with perceptions, leads thence to comprehensions, and ends with ideas".

Not without reason did he compare his philosophy with the astronomy of Copernicus. In ancient times the earth was supposed to stand still and the sun to turn around it. Astronomical calculations went wrong. But when Copernicus reversed the order, made the sun stand still and the earth revolve around it, all went well. So at one time the reason of man turned around the world of phenomena and sought to enlighten it. But Kant commanded the sun of reason to stand still, and it obeyed, and the world of phenomena turned around it and it was enlightened according to the degree in which it came within its sphere.

In his efforts to escape the scepticism of Hume and the materialism of Holbach, both of which were the outcome of the sensationalism of Locke, he found a *via media* between rationalism and empiricism. He conserved the truth of each and yet advanced beyond both. To the rationalist he would say, you cannot build up a world of ideas, which is independent of experience. To the empiricist he would say, the mind is more than a *tabula rasa*, a sensitive plate upon which sense impressions are photographed. Your experience cannot become objects of knowledge to the mind at all unless it fulfils the requirements of space, time, causation, and the mental categories, which are conditions imposed by the inherent nature of thought. Hence his notable dictum: "*Gedanken ohne Inhalt sind leer; Anschauungen ohne Begriffe sind blind.*" The chaos of sensations is transformed into a cosmos of ideas by the creative activity of the reason operating according to necessary laws.

He found the pure reason limited in its scope to the

phenomenal world. That which is behind the phenomena, *das Ding an Sich*, the *noumenon*, we cannot know. For, in order to become an object of knowledge, the thing as it really is must assume the mental forms of time, space, and causation, which are the inevitable conditions of any possible experience or knowledge whatsoever. The existence of the *noumenon* is problematic. We can neither affirm nor deny it. Thus he dealt a fatal blow to metaphysics which has to do with the absolute and eternal behind the finite and temporal. God himself is the *noumenon*. In his critique of the three proofs of the existence of God—the ontological, the cosmological, and the theological—he shows that they are wholly inconclusive. With the pure reason alone man cannot find God. Only after Kant had done his work could Professor James write in his *Varieties of Religious Experience:*

"That vast literature of proofs of God's existence drawn from the order of nature, which a century ago seemed so overwhelmingly convincing, today does little more than gather dust in libraries for the simple reason that our generation has ceased to believe in the kind of God it argued for. Whatever sort of being God may be, we *know* today that he is nevermore that mere external inventor of 'contrivances' intended to make manifest his 'glory', in which our great-grandfathers took such satisfaction."

Heine says:

"Kant stormed heaven, put all the garrison to the sword; the ruler of the world swims senseless in his blood; there is no more any mercy, or fatherly goodness, or future reward for present privations; the immortality of the soul is in its last agonies—death rattles and groans! And old Lampe [Kant's body servant] stands by with his umbrella under his arm as a sorrowing spectator and the sweat of anguish and tears runs down his cheeks. Then Immanuel Kant is moved to pity, and shows himself not only a great philosopher, but a good man. Half good-naturedly and half-ironically he says: Old Lampe must have a God, or else the poor man cannot be happy; and people really ought to be happy in this world. Well for all I care, let the practical reason guarantee the existence of God" (*Germany*, I, p. 151).

Kant, indeed, put God out of the front door of the pure reason and then let him in the back door of the practical reason. From Rousseau, whose portrait is said to have been the only unconventional picture on the walls of his

study, he learned that there were other ways to truth in "the deep hidden nature of man" than those of the logical mind. He made room for the postulates of the will as well as for the conclusions of the reason. Just as the pure reason in its cognition was controlled by inherent laws; so the practical reason in its action was regulated by necessary conditions. The will is confronted by the categorical imperative, "Thou shalt". This command is not a conclusion of the pure reason; nor is it the voice of human desire. It is an unavoidable and universal impulse from the time-less and space-less realm, the transcendent world. When man responds to the "Thou shalt" with an "I will", he becomes a free personality, ceases to be a creature of necessity, dominates his material and temporal surroundings, and abides in the eternal. "A man judges that he can do a thing", Kant says in the *Critique of the Practical Reason*, "because he is conscious that he ought to do it, and so recognizes in himself freedom which would have remained undiscovered by him, had it not been for the moral law." The maxim, by which the will is to be controlled always and everywhere, is "to so act that the rule governing thy will may always serve as a principle of universal legislation". What else is this but the Golden Rule in philosophic terms!

God and immortality, as well as freedom, are postulates of the practical reason. Our moral nature needs to assume immortality and God, both of which are beyond the scope of the pure reason. To attain the highest good, which is a union of virtue and happiness, requires more than a finite life. Only by endless progression can virtue reach perfect realization. Thus immortality is a necessity for the completion of the moral life. On this point he writes clearly in the *Critique of the Practical Reason*, saying:

"The realization of the *summum bonum* in the world is the necessary object of a will determinable by the moral law. But in this will the *perfect accordance* of the mind with the moral law is the supreme condition of the *summum bonum*. This then must be pos-

sible, as well as its object, since it is contained in the command to promote the latter. Now the perfect accordance of the will with the moral law is *holiness*, a perfection of which no rational being of the sensible world is capable at any moment of his existence. Since, nevertheless, it is required as practically necessary, it can only be found in a *progressus in infinitum* towards that perfect accordance, and on the principles of pure practical reason it is necessary to assume such a practical progress as the real object of our will.

"Now this endless progress is only possible on the supposition of an *endless* duration of the *existence* and personality of the same rational being (which is called the immortality of the soul)".

In the same way the idea of the highest good leads men to assume the existence of God. For only a supreme moral being can make virtue lead to happiness, that is, only such a being can supply the second element of the highest good. To quote again from the *Practical Reason:*

"Accordingly, the existence of a cause of all nature, distinct from nature itself and containing the principle of this connection, namely, of the exact harmony of happiness with morality, is also *postulated*. Now, this supreme cause must contain the principle of the harmony of nature, not merely with a law of the will of rational beings, but with the conception of this law, in so far as they make it the supreme determining principle of the will, and consequently not merely with the form of morals, but with their morality as their motive, that is, with their moral character. Therefore the highest good is possible in the world only on the supposition of a supreme Being having a causality corresponding to moral character . . . that is, it is morally necessary to assume the existence of God."

While these factors of the religious and moral life are mere postulates in the beginning of the moral life, in the development of ethical character they become the supreme realities of human experience. These realities, however, lie beyond the province of natural science, which can neither prove nor disprove them. To reduce them to a purely naturalistic basis would be a direct violation of the constitution of the human mind itself.

4. THE THEOLOGICAL INFLUENCE OF THE KANTIAN PHILOSOPHY

The tendency of religion, under the influence of eighteenth century rationalism, was toward deism, which separated God from the world; of ethics, toward utilitari-

anism or hedonism, whose ideal was profit or pleasure; of politics, towards individualism, pleading for a return to nature and protesting against all social and political institutions.

Kant was a vigorous opponent of these ideas. He found God not outside of, but in, the world; not dwelling apart from the world of thought and action, but in the center of it, as the author and governor of the moral order, an immanent as well as a transcendent God. Against hedonism and utilitarianism he affirmed the law of moral obligation—duty for its own sake without regard for expedience or happiness. He refused to make the end of government the happiness and prosperity of the individual. Man is a moral being and is never to be treated as a means but always as an end. He has rights to claim, but also duties to render. He is both an individual and a member of a social organism; and his personality will be developed only as he is true to himself and to his fellows. The appreciation of this ideal will bind mankind into social communities which will resist revolutions growing out of an unrestrained individualism as well as tyranny growing out of an unlimited monarchy. He was, indeed, the last product of rationalism; but he became, also, its most subtle antagonist.

Professor Paulsen considered Kant the philosopher of Protestantism, just as Thomas Aquinas is the philosopher of Catholicism. By this he doubtless meant, that, *without deliberate purpose*, he furnished a philosophic basis for the religious principles of Luther and his contemporaries.

I have said above that Luther and Kant were irrationalists in their conception of the relation between faith and reason. Luther found revelation the only source of religious truth and faith the organ of its appropriation. Faith in God is not based on logical demonstration or historical research, but on the immediate apprehension of the heart. With the heart man believeth unto righteousness. This corresponds to Kant's anti-intellectualism denying that

the pure reason can attain a knowledge of God and of His kingdom, but finding access to the realm of the divine through the will or the practical reason. The reformer and the philosopher find the way to God, not through the intellect, but through the will.

The certainty or proof of truth, therefore, is not in an external authority whether council, pope, or book. The Reformers appealed to the *testimonium spiritus sancti* in the soul of man. The philosopher insists on the autonomy of the reason, so that all truth, natural or revealed, must finally authenticate itself in pure reason or the practical reason, beyond which there is no court of appeal. The seat of authority is in man, in whom reality and reason meet and blend so as to produce in a mysterious way a sense of assurance. What is in Christ and in the Scriptures must eventually approve itself in "the deep hidden nature of man" where it becomes spirit and life. Luther and Kant renounced in principle the religions of authority and were seeking the religion of the spirit.

The logical outcome of this view is a new apologetic. Men once tried to demonstrate the truths of religion with the same clearness that they would prove a geometrical theorem. They based their arguments on the discursive reason. *Denknothwendigkeit ist Seinsnothwendigkeit.* This is the fundamental axiom of all rationalists and semi-rationalists. But Kant showed it to be fallacious when he proved the futility of metaphysics and of the arguments for the existence of God. We do not prove one-half of religious truth by the reason and accept the other half on faith. The natural theology of Aquinas and of Paley is baseless, if the Kantian theory of knowledge is correct. The new apologetics must prove God by demanding a moral life rather than by proving a religious dogma. The emphasis is shifted from creeds to deeds. Kant and Luther revert to the method of Jesus when He says: "If any man willeth to do his will, he shall know of the teaching, whether it is of God or whether I speak from myself."

The obedience of faith which the Apostle requires is the counterpart of obedience to the categorical imperative which the philosopher proclaims.

Again, when Kant declares that the worth of man is in the disposition of the will, not in its achievements, he is in close accord with the doctrine of justification by faith, rather than by works. To say that man is what he wills, is about the same as to say that man is what he believes. "*Wer glaubt*", says Luther, "*der hat.*" "The only good thing in the world", says Kant, "is a good will; and the only bad thing is a bad will." Both men are ardent champions of sincerity, inwardness, reality, and the ethical in religion as over against formalism, ceremonialism, dogmatism, and mysticism.

Harnack tells us that the Reformers "abolished dogmatic Christianity and put in its place a new evangelical conception of it". By dogmatic Christianity he means a series of dogmas and precepts which have been revealed by God once for all and are to be accepted by men as finished and infallible to the end of time. It involves the full sway of absolutism in religion. By the new evangelical conception of it, he means that Christianity is a proclamation of gospel; the good news of the kingdom of God, the blessings of which men receive by repentance and faith. In other words, Christianity is a spontaneous life of faith, hope, and love—the direct opposite of dogmatic absolutism.

When Kant discovered the limits of the human mind theological and ethical dogmatism was for ever doomed. A final and finished system of doctrine and morals can neither be immediately revealed to man nor directly discovered by man. Such revelation or discovery would contradict the laws of his psychic nature. Only by human experience, by gradual conformity to the mind and will of God, can men come to a knowledge of God's thought and of God's will. Therefore our theology and our ethics are always relative, never absolute. Only when

we are like Him, can we see Him as He is. This, of course, involves progressive advance in knowledge and in morals, and the necessity of constant reconstruction of theology and of ethics. In this respect Kant led men back to Jesus who promised to guide men by the spirit of truth into all truth.

Authoritative absolutism, whether ecclesiastical, scriptural, or rationalistic, in all its forms the source of so much intolerance and bigotry and the bane of a free development of life in God, is destined to decline and pass away. We turn to the past, with its deeds and its creeds, not, as we once did, to find an infallible revelation of doctrine and law, but a continuously unfolding revelation of God in man and of man to humanity. Truth is not static but genetic. We are in the process of attaining it—the goal is not in a past age but in a future aeon.

To summarize, in conclusion, Kant counteracted deism by his emphasis on divine immanence; pantheism by his doctrine of the categorical imperative; hedonism and utilitarianism by his insistence on unconditional moral obedience; individualism by his recognition of social obligation.

For the evangelical ideals of the original Reformers he found a psychological basis—for the necessity of revelation, the efficacy of grace, the *testimonium spiritus sancti*, justification by faith.

In defining the scope and limits of the reason he laid the foundations of a new apologetic, and shifted emphasis from dogmas to deeds, from the speculative to the ethical. He abolished in principle all theological and ethical absolutism by proving the necessity of a gradual growth in the apprehension of religious truth and moral law, which presupposes theological and ethical reconstruction from time to time.

Kant's greatness consisted not simply in solving problems but also in raising questions. He marked out new paths for the mental and moral progress of the race. The

world may forget his habitation and his name, but it can never efface from its intellectual and spiritual life the influence of the philosopher of Koenigsberg.

LANCASTER, PENN.

The Churches and Secularist Democrats

By John Edward Mercer, D.D.,
Bishop of Tasmania, 1902–1914.

Manifold are the problems which in this strenuous and eventful age are pressing hard upon the Churches. They are rife in every sphere of thought and action, theological, critical, scientific, moral and social. At times we are tempted to deem them overwhelming. But in our better moments we realize that they ring out a splendid challenge to our manhood and our faith.

The particular problem with which I propose to deal in this article is in many respects the most urgent, and perhaps also the most difficult of them all. How shall the Churches close up the gap that yawns between them and the great masses of the toilers? How shall they permeate with Christian principles the Labour Movement —the Social Democracy? None who are in touch with the actual conditions of modern life can doubt that these are indeed portentous questions. For a new social order is coming into being, swiftly, inevitably. Tremendous issues are at stake, which, according as they are determined in one way or another, will bring happiness or misery to coming generations. And alas! broadly speaking, the Churches stand aloof; while most of the thinkers and leaders of the new movement regard them either with tolerant indifference or with feelings of positive hostility. Meantime, the social democrats, strong in numbers and in organization, are gaining rapidly in propagandist influence and in political power. They have deep convic-

tions and keen enthusiasms, and they are confident of success.

Let me at once, and once for all, make it clear that I do not ignore certain compensating facts. There are many individual Christians, and even groups of Christians, who have manifested sincere sympathy with the strivings of the masses to win for themselves a place in the sun, and a chance of developing and living a truly human life. On the other hand, there are many in all sections of the Labour Movement who are professed and consistent Christians. I am here concerned with general tendencies, with what I might call average attitudes. Let me also disclaim any desire, in what I have here to say, to hold a brief for any particular theory or doctrine, either religious or social; I would detach myself, as far as possible from these, and would ask for dispassionate reflection on certain fundamental principles which underlie the aims and ideals of all who are in earnest in the cause of social reform.

How sharply the antagonism between the Churches and the more secularist sections of the social democrats may sometimes be defined! Here are two instances. Belford Bax, a militant anti-Christian, frames a pregnant antithesis—"Ye cannot serve God and humanity." In strange agreement with him, from an opposing standpoint, a Methodist Ferney Lecturer declared—"Fidelity to truth should make us ever speak of Christianity and Socialism as distinct, and, in many respects, antagonistic systems." Is it not plain that the one has failed to grasp what is implied in the service of God, and that the other has not got to the core of the socialists' ideals? Straightway, then, there is suggested a method of bringing these opponents to a better mutual understanding. We can cry to them, with a new depth of meaning in the appeal—"Sirs, ye are brethren."

The fact is that few on either side have yet approached in a sufficiently large and generous spirit the matters so

hotly debated. The battle has been fought with long range guns. Party interests, inherited prejudices, economic strains, unwarranted dogmatisms, have obscured the real issues, and have led to fatuous recriminations. But the time has come when wiser tactics may be adopted for the advantage of all, and for the attainment, by reflective comprehension, of what is, or at least of what should be, a common aim.

These considerations force on our attention the possibility of reconciliation. We proceed to ask what should be the method adopted if it is to be brought about. Obviously its most conspicuous mark will be an examination of first principles and of their applications—a making explicit of what is so sadly still only implicit. What does Christianity, stripped of the accretions of centuries, really stand for? At what is the social democrat really driving when he clamours for a reconstitution of society? Until such fundamentals have been critically probed and analysed, confusion will reign. And if we would arrive at sound conclusions, we must study the causes that have brought into existence the clashing views and interests that constitute our present difficulty. That is to say, in logical phrase, we must be careful to distinguish "properties" from "separable accidents". We sadly need a Socrates to bring to the birth the fundamental concepts that are implicit in our premisses. Until we have thus cleared our minds, Christian and Secularist Democrat will never understand one another, just because they do not really understand themselves.

If discussion is conducted on this broad and generous basis, there will be no eagerness to fasten on the tenets and teachings of any particular body or section, still less of any individual. Special proposals, for instance, as to Capital and Production, or as to Property and State Control, will be relegated to the background. So also with regard to the varying dogmas that cause divisions among the Churches, or pronouncements of individual

theologians, however eminent. And further, due allowance will be made for the selfishness and imperfection that mar so grievously all human projects and institutions. Let him that is without guilt cast the first stone. Nothing is so fatally easy as to

> "Condone the sins we are inclined to
> By damning those we have no mind to."

It behoves us all to be humble and teachable—the Churches no less than the secularists. The pages of history have some sad tales to tell!

Adopting, then, something of the Socratic method of enquiry, let us briefly pass in review certain of the more significant charges hurled at each other by these antagonists who, if deeper counsel were taken, could metamorphose our tottering civilization, and speed the good times that are to be.

I suppose it is safe to say that the Churches, as a whole, regard the social movement as being essentially and hopelessly secularist. And undoubtedly there is much ground for forming such a judgment. Leading democrats have fiercely denounced religion, and powerful thinkers of their party have solemnly declared that it must be extirpated. Recall Bax's aphorism: "Ye cannot serve God and humanity." But before accepting such pronouncements as of the essence of the movement, let us see whether we cannot show these to be separable accidents. The task is not difficult. Modern Socialism started with a particular and passing phase of philosophical speculation. Its early founders in France were mostly entangled in the meshes of a sensationalist materialism. In Germany, the founders (more especially Marx) came under the influence of the negative school of Hegelians. And in both these countries, largely owing to the selfishness and inefficiency of the Churches, Christianity had come to be regarded as essentially the religion of Capitalism. This illusion was powerfully championed by men of great learning, and became an integral part of the social demo-

crat's creed. What is the remedy? Let the Churches unhesitatingly take their share of the blame. They can then be free to point out that the Christianity, so imperfectly preached and lived, has, as its Founder, the Carpenter of Nazareth, Who had not where to lay His head, and Who never ceased to warn men against the deceitfulness of riches.

But it will be asked—Does Christianity condemn Capital? By no means—not Capital in itself, nor even a capitalist system. Still less, however, does it condemn those who oppose such a system. It simply lays down the broad principle that men shall treat each other as brothers, and, by doing as they would be done by, should seek each others' highest good. The question just propounded now takes a new form. Does the actually existing capitalistic system of modern civilization fulfil these conditions? I presume that Lecky will be generally accepted as a solid and careful critic; and he has expressed himself unreservedly on the fallacy of connecting the existing form of our civilization with Christianity. He points out that it is founded on Political Economy, and that the main doctrines of Political Economy, so far as they convey precepts, are absolutely hostile to the ideals of Jesus Christ. Herbert Spencer, again an uncompromising critic of State interference, declares that, in modern society, we have a divorce between ideals and conduct greater perhaps than has ever before existed in the world. Should not such pronouncements as these give, to even the most conservative Christians, cause for grave reflection? And on the other hand, should not the most advanced social reformer hesitate to saddle Christianity with the onus of the evils he deplores? Before striving further with each other, let the opponents arrive at some conclusions as to what is the inwardness of the Gospel. The conception of humanity which it forces upon a fair-minded student is far removed from that of a crowd of warring atoms, disconnected save in so far as self-interest leads to

co-operation. Rather does it present to us that of a living organism, in which the whole exists for the parts and the parts for the whole. Such a social organism would secure, for each of its members, distributive justice, in the highest and fullest sense of the term; and each of the members would fulfil his part in working for the good of the whole. Humanity would thus tend to become a vast family, in which the spirit of selfish competition yields to that of service and sacrifice.

Many there are who lift up hands of horror when they speak of communists and anarchists, and who have never dreamt that they have much to learn, even from these extremists. "It is remarkable (says Dean Swift) with what Christian fortitude and resignation we can bear the suffering of other folk." As a contrast, recall the story of the soldier of the National Guard in the last days of the Commune. There he stood at his barricade, tense, gaunt, ready for death. No good things did he possess that this world could give; no good things did he expect in any other world. Asked why he thus risked his life, he replied—*Pour la solidarité humaine.* Little did he grasp of the wider meaning of his words, but that little sufficed to kindle in him the spirit of self-sacrifice. Or consider the anarchists in Russia—how that in the intensity of their convictions, they risked comfort, property, horrible imprisonment, execution—for the sake of an ideal. The methods employed we cannot for one moment approve —they are tragically mistaken. But how about the spirit they reveal? And speaking quite generally, we must often have wondered to see how that men and women of the highest culture flock to the standards of the extremists. We may deem them misguided; but let us at any rate give them credit for a greater share in the enthusiasm of humanity than most of us can claim. And let us not be too much astonished that reactions against social evils sometimes find stark and bizarre expression.

We have seen that to judge the Social Democracy

aright, we must take account of its origin and environment. This is no less true of Christianity. The lot of the early Church was cast amid social conditions so vastly different from ours, that we must call into liberal play the historian's imagination if we would avoid serious misconceptions. Knowledge of the conditions, indeed, is fairly satisfactory and general; it is the application of the knowledge that is so sadly lacking.

The Roman Empire was still supreme, but was corrupt and decadent, and throughout its wide dominions there reigned a pessimism so profound as to reduce the strongest and wisest of men to despair. Social and political activity, as we understand them, were impossible. The early Church was not exempted from the general strain, moral and spiritual. They took refuge in the belief that their Divine Master would return quickly and suddenly to put an end to the existing order. They turned their thoughts to apocalyptic literature, and meditated on the details of the approaching catastrophe. Thus arose a false dualism—an emphatic division between the Church and the world. It was only by slow degrees, as the Second Coming was delayed, and as the political horizon cleared, that these early Christians began any systematic study of the principles of their religion, or of its applications to conduct in a world that, after all, was evidently going to last. And when they did lift up their heads, and play their part in secular and political affairs, they were almost exclusively absorbed in defining the articles of their Creed. Their interests were chiefly philosophical and theological.

Now both these tendencies were natural, nay, we may say inevitable. The misfortune is that so few have learnt to regard them as "separable accidents", not "properties", of the Christian religion. The Churches have more or less adhered to the temporarily helpful, but none the less untenable dualism of primitive times. Their thoughts are too exclusively fixed on the other-worldly aspects of the Gospel to the detriment of its social aspects. They have

thus failed to keep touch with the profound changes, economic, social, and political, which the last century has witnessed. They have hugged their privileges, disputed among themselves, and maintained themselves as close corporations. What could we expect but that a rift should appear between them and the Social Democracy? And unhappily they are still throwing away their chances of closing up the rift—of retrieving their error. Those who claim to be distinctively Catholic are harking back to the rigidity of dogma and the meticulous care for ritual which characterized the Middle Ages. Those who claim to be distinctively Protestants, have not shaken themselves clear of the Reformation—a movement which laid splendid, but disproportionate stress on personal salvation. Meanwhile, outside both parties, there has grown to huge stature a purely secularist movement which often would fain banish the very name of God altogether—a movement which confines itself to the world of sense, and which accordingly appeals strongly to the masses who are determined to gain for themselves some sort of salvation here and now. The Churches have hitherto shown but small sympathy with Labour aspirations, and indeed have all too frequently opposed them. They cannot justly complain, therefore, if they are passed by, or are regarded as obstacles in the path of progress. Nay, with things as they are, might we not modify Bax's aphorism—with more than a shadow of excuse—Ye cannot serve the Churches and humanity.

And all this time there has been prominently held before all sections of Christians the life, the words, the example, of the Divine Founder of their religion! How wonderfully simple and natural He was in His blending, in closest union, of the inner and the outer—the seen and the unseen—the actual life of men with the fuller life He came to offer. He did not lay down rigid rules and precepts, but broad, deep principles which should cover the whole of human conduct and experience, and be adaptable

to all changes of place and circumstance. There is theology in His teaching; there is infinite solicitude for the individual soul; but there is also inspiration for social reform. We are coming to see that if a man has the Spirit of Christ, he is bound to use every legitimate means available for the social as well as the spiritual uplift of the people—to improve the environment, as well as to appeal to the conscience. Cannot the Churches frame some common policy on these larger lines ere it be altogether too late? There are cheering signs that such a consummation is not so difficult as may be imagined. Much as I personally regret the recrudescence of mediaevalism in certain of the Churches, I thankfully confess that the Catholic revival has a heart of gold. It cannot be denied that it has, to a greater degree than any other great movement, held out the right hand of fellowship to all who are striving for the ideal of human brotherhood. It believes that God intends His will to be done on earth as it is in heaven, and it acts on its belief. And the leaven is already working. Other sections of the Churches are assimilating this richer conception of what society can and should be, and of the part that the disciples of Christ should play, if true to their calling.

It may be thought that I have overlooked the conspicuous and continuous zeal of Christendom in almsgiving and relief of misery. Not so. But I urge that, in this very regard, we have a striking instance of the necessity for distinguishing between "accidents" and "properties". For it is in this matter of charity that the social democrat finds one of his most formidable weapons of attack. He accuses the Churches, and with a large measure of justice, of being content with the mere alleviation of poverty, instead of making any systematic effort to abolish it. Take a verse from quaint old Dr. Watts:

> Not more than others I deserve,
> Yet God has given me more.
> For I have food while others starve,
> And beg from door to door.

Or, again, a verse from a popular hymn:

> The rich man in his castle,
> The poor man at his gate,
> God made them, high and lowly,
> And ordered their estate.

There we have it in a nutshell! These effusions represent an attitude almost universally adopted by the Christian world. It did not occur to the writers to ask themselves whether, if they do not deserve more, they should necessarily have more. They simply fall back on the pious reflection that the providence of God has so ordered it. They acquiesce, with a half acknowledged conviction that the existence of the poor is necessary for the stimulation of the sentiment of benevolence. Perhaps, still further back in the region of the subconscious, there is a hope that

> Whatever, Lord, we give to Thee,
> Repaid a thousandfold will be.

Verily we need a higher conception of what, in our modern environment, charity should aim at and achieve!

But has either the Christian or the secularist any right to saddle Christianity with such an imperfect appreciation of the teaching of Christ? We have but to recall the social and economic conditions prevailing in His time. Anything like a definite policy in dealing with the problems of poverty was out of the question. Each case had to be dealt with on its own merits, and claimed relief as full and immediate as the circumstances allowed. (There will always be some place for such individualistic benevolence.) But the conditions now are profoundly changed. We can educate, legislate, modify the social and economic order. We are no longer compelled to stop short at mere palliatives—we can take definite measures for abolishing poverty, at any rate in the sense of destitution, and can enormously reduce the area of human misery. And who can doubt that such results are in accord with the mind and the purpose of Christ?

The early Church, crippled and restrained though it was as to ways and means, grasped the principle of Christian charity more firmly than we moderns do, and went to great lengths in its loyalty to it. How deeply significant is that passage in the Acts (watered down in the A. V.)—"Not one of them said that aught of the things he possessed was his own, but they had all things in common." The times were not ripe, nor are they yet ripe, to win success for so whole-hearted a venture. But there glows the ideal. Well might Lucian, the Voltaire of antiquity, exclaim with a sneer—"Their lawgiver has persuaded them that they are all brethren!" Does there not sound today, in the passionate cry for social righteousness, despite many crude and harsh overnotes, the same fundamental bass that made itself heard in that infant community? "The Spirit beareth witness with our spirit that we are sons of God." And if so—

A word as to the emphasis laid by social democrats upon the dignity and functions of the State. I am not discussing how far they are right or wrong in their contentions and their specific programmes; I am only asking whether their views on this subject are such as to bring them into antagonism with the principles of Christianity. He would indeed be a doctrinaire of the first water who should seriously maintain the affirmative. And yet the danger of misunderstandings on both sides is very real. Let us once more, by a glance at historical conditions, distinguish between "accidents" and "properties". It is well known how that, in their best days, the Greeks and Romans deemed participation in the affairs of State as the highest and most important duty of man. They realized far more vividly than we do the privileges and responsibilities of citizenship. But by the time Christianity appeared, the civic ideal had been crushed. The early Christians could not but see in the Roman government an alien, and often a hostile institution. They accepted it passively, and, as far as was consistent with their

conscience, rendered to Caesar the things that were Caesar's. But as they gained in numbers and influence, they intervened more and more in secular affairs, until at last the Church herself acquired the organization and functions of a State. There are many who lament this particular development as a fateful *faux pas*. There are also many to whom the very idea of even an Established Church is an abomination. A charge of Erastianism is still a thing to be dreaded. But are we not in danger of getting things into a wrong perspective? After all, the Greek and Roman ideal has much to say for itself; for it welded religion and politics into a living whole; it refused to cut human life into two opposed sections—the secular and the religious. What particular relations should obtain between any given Church and any given State, at any given period, affords material for sober and anxious discussion. But to deny that there should be any relations at all is assuredly a disastrous concession to the powers of evil—a hopeless and faithless cleavage in what should be a socialized and spiritualized unity.

Most certainly there is not Biblical warrant for such a cleavage. The whole of the Old Testament tells of such an organic union, and asserts that it was ordained of God. Even under New Testament conditions, St. Paul could declare that the Roman Empire was an instrument in God's hands, an outcome of His government of the world. And we remember that the Bible represents human history as beginning in a garden, and as finding its consummation in a City—the City of God. It is for the Churches to meditate on these facts, and absorb their inner meaning. And it is for the secularist reformer to ask himself whether he can hope to build up his own ideal State without the aid of a faith in the divine government of the world, in the spiritual nature of man, and in a nobler destiny than this life can ever offer. We may readily grant that with every advance in knowledge and in social organization there must be a corresponding advance in metaphysics

and theology. But this is not to say that we can afford to jettison metaphysics and theology altogether. Our ethics must have an adequate background; our social aspirations must have a firm foundation. The secularist's tendency, at present, is to a materialistic evolutionalism. If he cannot transcend this, there is nothing for him but anarchic tyranny. The brotherhood of man can only be realized in a permanent form if it finds its source and its binding power in the Fatherhood of God.

Once started on this line of thought, we might take up topic after topic—the function of reason and of science in working out social reform—the institution of Property—the monogamous Family—and so on indefinitely. But my object has not been to enter into detail; I have tried to suggest a "method". In every department of enquiry, it is now acknowledged that the question of "method" is of primary importance, and we may take it for granted that the problems which separate the Churches and the masses will not prove an exception to the rule. The chasm yawns. How shall it be most speedily bridged? Only by both sides being honestly prepared to strip away all that is of comparative irrelevance in their respective doctrines and projects—to put away all prejudice and party antipathy—to co-operate in what should be, and essentially is, their common aim. The difficulties are multitudinous and complex; it would be folly to ignore them. But if they are not bravely met, social and religious disaster are ahead of us. A house thus divided against itself cannot stand.

The Churches and the Democracy are alike on their trial, and will be judged by their fruits. The accumulating evils of industrial civilization call for social solidarity and corporate action on the grand scale. Down in their hearts, the masses are yearning for a gospel that is spiritual because it is humanitarian, and humanitarian because it is spiritual. Can the disorganized and dismembered armies ever be brought into line to do common battle in

the cause of social righteousness and brotherhood? Yes —if a rallying point be found in the principles laid down by Him, Who, in the fullest and supremest degree, "had compassion on the multitudes".

Social Worship

By Lester Leake Riley.

In these days of Democracy's coming-of-age one goal appears as the inevitable outcome of all our social philosophy. That goal is the creation of a community into a spiritual organism. It is not sufficient that Democracy be aggressive, alert and well organized for action; there must also be the consciousness of an ethical purpose to be served by all this activity. To awaken that consciousness, to spiritualize Democracy, and give expression to social ideals, the institutions of religion must consider as their great opportunity the office of Social Worship. The community must be conceived of as a spiritual organism, and Social Worship as the outpouring of this common communal soul expressing its needs and aspirations.

It is this day of the social question that brings this demand upon us, and there is a social question today because the social unrest that is ever present is coming to a focus and finding a voice. You may not like the expressions of that voice; it may seem harsh, crude, vulgar, and be very unsocial in its logic, but of this thing be sure—it is going to survive its crudities and grow more and more unto that perfect day that has ever been the dream of the idealists of all ages. Since we are the creatures, in large part, of the day in which we live, we face the fact that it is this social question that determines our lives and moulds our point of view so that we cannot escape the insistent emphasis that the truth that men live by, in all its spiritual significance, spells Social Duty. But the melancholy thing about our aspirations for social better-

ment is that they are so vague; our purposes are not clearly defined, and consequently the issues of any social problem tend to become confused and the strife embittered, not only because of the inevitable conflict of our idealism with the materialism we meet in our science, philosophy, and the dominant spirit of commercialism, but also because of the conflict that is waged among the idealists themselves. If the sharpness of this conflict is to be softened I look to the offices of religion as the spiritual energy needed to bring unity of purpose in the solution of this world's problems.

I maintain, therefore, that the religious idealism which is dominated by the passion for social justice, because it lacks adequate expression in current religious formulas, must not only create new phases of theology, but, more important still, must also find its way to the hearts of the people through the mediation of art and the symbolism of ritual. Such an expression of social ideals through the offices of religious worship as a medium for spiritualizing Democracy I term Social Worship. I consider, then, the development of this subject of Social Worship under five headings, which I summarize briefly as follows:

(1) The social emphasis of our day has brought higher values to human relationships. If these values are to be maintained and developed, they must find religious expression. Only in this way can we hope that all life shall be a sacrament and its every sphere of activity made sacred. It is therefore apparent that the personal note of the old evangelism, with its emphasis upon the value of the individual soul, receives added emphasis when we give religious expression to the salvation of our common life and, by awakening Society to the consciousness of itself as a corporate spiritual entity, bring to bear upon Society the same high purpose and noble conviction that characterize the individual.

(2) Because the institutions of Religion have been slow in feeling the quickening pulse of the social passion of our

day, it has happened that men have turned from the formal religious expression and set this social passion above all things else, and so have infused into Democracy that spiritual longing that Religion inspires so completely. This fact we must recognize, then, as a manifestation of the working of the Holy Spirit in the affairs of men, and open our eyes and awaken our souls to a more vivid realization of God's presence and God's longing for His children in their common life. Upon such an experience as this we must build a larger faith in God in His World.

(3) The problem of today, then, is the awakening of this social passion in the hearts of the people, and this is a work primarily for the minister of religion rather than the sociologist or social philosopher. I consider the position of the minister of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America. Here is a Church, conservative in expression, yet liberal in interpretation, and warmly receptive to the teaching of what may be termed the Social Gospel. Here is a teaching Church, bringing the great truths of Religion to the minds of men, not only by the processes of preaching and teaching, but also through the more effective and reverent mechanism of Symbol, Sacrament, and Ceremonial. In these pictured parables this Church has the unusual opportunity to awaken the social passion and plead for the coming of the Kingdom of God as a Society redeemed by Christ in all its human relations.

(4) It is the rich ceremonial and symbolic expression in the worship of the Church that affords an important medium for developing and strengthening the ideals of the individual life. This is the great function of the Church. If we hope, therefore, to see the ideals of our community life come to pass, we must seek them in worship that inspires and strengthens the soul of our community life—Social Worship. To find the soul of our community life, however, is the problem before us today. With the growth of Democracy the consciousness of citizenship has received added emphasis and recognition; and, con-

sequently, as a unit of expression it is the appeal to our national idealism wherein the community may find spiritual expression. Thus, our social as well as our individual salvation becomes the great goal in the search for the more abundant life.

(5) The Book of Common Prayer as a liturgical expression of the aspirations and directions of the individual soul life was the result of many trials and changes in the bitter conflicts of religious controversy during the Reformation. The Book was the compromise between the extremists of two contending parties, but it established the principle of tolerance with widely differing points of view and a comprehensiveness for the sake of truth that permits enough elasticity to welcome change when necessary. That principle we must apply today if we hope to have the Church of the historic Prayer Book meet this new reformation of religious expression. To do this we need the same freedom of choice in liturgical expression to inspire social ideals, knowing certainly that a dignified norm of worship, generally satisfactory, will be the outcome. This means also that we need a larger freedom in the conception of the prophetic office. In these days, when all life is the province of Religion, it happens that the ordained minister cannot fulfil all the demands that his office makes upon him. He must, therefore, call upon those men and women of affairs who are truly "Shepherds of the People" to share in the prophetic ministry of the Church, and give them their due recognition as ministers and preachers of the common life.

In this way Social Worship may be established in the Church to develop and strengthen the soul of the community life and make dominant in the hearts of the people the democratic ideals of social justice.

I

It is the great office of Religion to unify the discordant elements that enter into human life. When a man faces

the fragmentary experiences of his own life, the inequalities and injustices that press upon him, he realizes that he faces a very unideal world. Let him but recognize the Power outside ourselves that makes ideals come true, then the offices of Religion afford him a great source of strength and power in unifying these discordant elements and creating a world to live in. This world, viewed in the light of his social ideals, becomes the voice of God speaking to the needs and aspirations of the soul of his community as well as his own soul. As a minister of religion and more particularly as a priest of the Christian Church, I see the possibilities that my religion and my church may use in the expression of social ideals and in the conflict of social issues.

Now I face a dilemma. I do not always find myself at ease in this world that seeks social expression through the function of the Christian faith, for I am reminded by some that the expression of social ideals is what is technically termed "secular" and not at all related directly to the great work of the Christian faith. That great work, they say, is the salvation of the soul of the individual from sin through the acceptance of the new life revealed in Christ, who by taking the world's sin upon Himself brings those who accept Him into harmony with God's will. The means to the great end of the salvation of the soul sounds the note of the evangelism of the Christian Church with which we are all familiar, either an appeal to be converted, as the manner of some is, or an appeal to accept the saving grace of the sacraments and receive God into the soul in that way. The point that I would make is, that this emphasis is concerned primarily and almost wholly with the individual, apart from any relation he may bear to his neighbour; and that the only hope this evangelism holds out for the progressive development of social institutions and community ideals is through individual change of character, and this can only be effected through this order of individual salvation. I

state this briefly and necessarily crudely. I believe that it is a statement of an immense fact in human experience, and to all spiritually minded people will ever be the elementary fact of the power of the Christian faith. But, nevertheless, let us face the fact that it does not contain all the truth of God in His relations with Man. We are in need of a new theological expression that shall take into account all the great facts of human life and history that make up the world we live in today. For what we need today and, being creatures of this day, what we are forced to face, is a theological expression based upon the revelations of the Holy Spirit to the minds of men through such modern social sciences as Biology, Psychology and Sociology. I do not forget, of course, that my own religious experience began in a region of spiritual life far removed from these modern movements, but it has not so continued. Now I am forced to the realization that Christ's redemptive work for humanity concerns me vitally more because of the solidarity of human relationships than it does as an individual beneficiary of His life and passion.

The significance of all the social and intellectual unrest of this day is not difficult to see when we realize that a new consciousness of humanity has entered into our lives and we are no longer thinking of ourselves in terms of isolated individuals, as though our relations were no closer than that of sand grains upon the seashore, but rather are we recognizing a spiritual atmosphere of human relationships that envelop us and bind us not only to God and our neighbour but also to the community created by these relationships. We *are* individuals—true—but individuals that enter consciously and unconsciously into relations: relations of family, church, city, nation, and subordinate groups. It is the relations that are most important and make up this thing we call Society. We are appealing all the time to these social relationships, and for the great masses of the people it is this social order that deter-

mines them rather more than their own volitions. This is not a denial of the freedom of the individual will, for we are not left without a large amount of choice, but the fact to be accepted is that we live unconsciously by a social, as surely as we do by a physical, atmosphere. All this you say is not new. You have heard it before and have recognized the truth of it. True, but have you lived, and has Society lived, in the consciousness of that truth? Rather, has not the life of Society been all against the idea that there was any possibility of entering into social relationships and moulding those relationships to our ideals and aspirations? Have we not always evaded that difficulty and contented ourselves with the wasteful and purposeless system of leaving Society to get along as best it could and directed our attention to the individual with the hope that his salvation would attain social salvation also? That is what I mean when I speak of our individual relations as sands upon the seashore. The true conception of our relations is rather that of cells in a great living organism, or members of a great body that could be intelligently directed with conscious purpose to fulfil the functions of Society toward that ideal State, which a modern writer expresses truly in religious terms today when he calls it "the republic of God"—so naturally have religious terms been coloured and moulded by the social institutions of the day that created them.

It would be an interesting study, for instance, to see how social development has influenced religious thought. God is not a king to the people until they have developed a king socially. God is a despot of fearful mien under a despotic government. When man's conception of life centers in his tribe or nation, his God is a tribal god or a national god. So it is true to say that the various attributes applied to God are the reflex of the social consciousness of the time, and whatever form his sense of dependence upon God may take depends in large measure upon the social development of the man. And so it was natural,

for instance, that, when the people were subject to the rule of the divine right of kings, it was manifestly impossible to give religious expression to the injustices of such a system, for thereby one might be found fighting against God. It was a religious thing to be taught in regard to his social life that a man was to order himself lowly and reverently to all his betters and be content in that state of life unto which it pleased God to call him. Any discussion of the relationships of his community would have been entirely outside the province of religion and stigmatized as "secular" and branded as "heresy". Now we are engaged in living up to the ideals of a Democracy. The people, we say, is the power ordained of God. A new world of responsibilities and aspirations and enthusiasms is thrust upon us; a blaze of new lights has been turned upon us and we stand bewildered in the glare of it all.

The perplexed Pilgrim of a past day cried out: "What shall I do to be saved?" And Evangelist answered: "Flee from the wrath to come!" It was a fitting direction for Pilgrim's journey to the Celestial City, for he had been taught to believe that his life was primarily concerned with the supreme individual responsibility of attaining citizenship in another and far better world than this. But the Pilgrim of today as he stands before the problems of his Vanity Fair community is not so ready to flee, but speaks out boldly: "What shall we do to save?" For he sees the task as a social responsibility that God places upon him as a citizen in a Democracy, and he answers it as the call of God.

II

So our modern Pilgrim, seized with the passion of the social consciousness of our day, and despairing of finding answer in the catechism of his religion, proceeds to make a religion out of his social passion. He makes a religion, if you please, of Socialism. It brings to him all the high intensity of emotion that religion brings and it offers what

he considers a practical adjustment of the inequalities and injustices of this world. But modern Socialism was born of the materialistic philosophy of the middle of the nineteenth century and it shows the marks of that hard, bitter, materialistic spirit. Ethically, it springs from Christianity, but in spirit it is more related to the old régime. And yet it has the power to rouse moral fervour and spiritual enthusiasm. Why? Because it spiritualizes Democracy, crude though that spiritual life be. Perhaps some may fail to appreciate the kinship of spirituality when compared with that developed by the traditional type of personal religion, and perhaps some may even tremble in amazement at the daring ventures of faith of these prophets of a new era, fearing at each moment to see the plan of salvation go to pieces. No doubt there will be many mistakes and indiscretions in the name of Religion; no doubt there will be false prophets who will arise and carry many with them; but if we believe in the ultimate triumph of the righteousness that exalteth a nation we will believe in the triumph of this social gospel. There is bound to be a settlement of these questions, and the necessity is laid upon us to put these social aspirations to the test and find the answer to our questionings in the great passion for humanity, in the search for the Kingdom of God and His righteousness. Here is a task that does not minimize the culture of the individual soul but, in giving that soul its task in the bringing in of the Kingdom, it enlarges the purpose and broadens the scope of a man's life into an ever-expanding sphere of possibilities.

It sometimes seems, and this is the reason that those of little faith in the social gospel are so fearful, that in yielding to the overwhelming passion for humanity, there is but little evidence of that thirst for the living God that should be the mark of true spiritual fervour. No doubt this social gospel is not so explicit in its demands of intellectual assent to a series of propositions as its basis of salvation. Rather it issues a summons to the highest

spiritual courage, in the name of God, to go forth and battle; "it puts the sword in our hands and sends us to the front!" The danger that confronts these soldiers of the common good is not defeat, so much as that more subtle danger—that they shall forget the clarion call to battle in the midst of their strenuous fighting, and lest, as the ancient chronicle hath it, "thou say in thine heart: My power and the might of mine hand hath gotten me this wealth. But thou shalt remember the Lord thy God, for it is he that giveth thee power to get wealth; that he may establish his covenant." That was a true word that comes to us from that scullion of the monastery kitchen when he preaches to us of the Practise of the Presence of God. To the man of God all life is a sacrament.

> "Earth's crammed with Heaven
> And every common bush afire with God."

So must it be in the service of worship. We are to practise the Presence of God.

Well may we search our hearts to see if we are so much under the domination of the materialism of our day that we think our thoughts and do our work in material terms and have no consciousness of anything spiritual guiding our activities. There have been days in the past when Society was God-conscious. There have been times in the history of the world when the people took the Eternal into account. We go back in these days to the chronicles of the Hebrew people to read again of the nation that lived in the consciousness of the Presence of God. Their great prophets speak to us with a compelling voice in these days when we seek to hallow the name of God in improving daily life. So too, despite its limitations, we know of a certainty that the Mediaeval Church had the God-consciousness and drew very near to His Presence. So too, our own stern Pilgrim Fathers founded their commonwealth on these shores as a Theocracy. God should be their king! How does that conception of the Presence of God enter into the activities of our civilization today?

Do we count the Eternal in the expression of our art, literature, politics? Ask the average man today, as the author of *Crowds* pictures himself appealing to the hurrying crowds on London's streets:

"Where are we going?
And nobody knew.
It was all the same questioning I had just left in New York, going up all about me, out of the skyscrapers.
New York did not know.
Now London did not know."

Your average man may very well consider it an open question and almost an impertinence as to whether one even need to believe in God. So immersed are we in the creations of this day that we are more than content to live on the outside of things and never pierce the heart of the meaning of it all, never appreciate spiritual values, because our commonwealth is not in Heaven, as was St. Paul's; rather, it is confined, bound and limited by the activities of this present world. No doubt the other-worldliness was an extreme emphasis of our individualistic religious expression of a past day, but certainly we of today are too much under the dominance of that habit of mind produced by our wondrous material increase. Certainly, as one apt phrase puts it, "we are wandering about in a luxuriant jungle of utilitarian ideas".

But the day of the Lord is at hand! The reaction must come. Man cannot live by bread alone. He can only live—this is the Gospel—by every word that proceedeth from the mouth of God. Let us not fear that we shall forget to talk of God or to God if we yield to the fascinations of the social emphasis of the Gospel. It sounds its note of personal appeal; it has its saints; it preaches its evangelism and brings conversion and a new life to all that receive its message. It will bring the Presence of God as a reality nearer and nearer to the heart of every-day activities; it will break down the barriers that rise and form water-tight compartments in a man's soul between the standards of his religious life and the stand-

ards of his commercial life. The Day of the Lord is at hand!

III

I face the problems of today, then, as a leader in that great Christian organization, the Church, as one whose office as priest demands that his life be given to the interpretation of the great mystery of life—the life of God in the soul of Man. I am loyal to the religious community I serve. I consciously acknowledge that it moulds my life in accordance with its traditions and spirit, and I gratefully acknowledge my indebtedness to my Church. But I also gratefully recognize the fact that, in her spirit of comprehensiveness for the sake of truth, my Church recognizes that my position as a leader gives me the opportunity to develop according to the demands of my own personality. Moreover, the necessity is laid upon me that the creative work for which the Church has prepared me, and which I daily perform under her tutelage, must return again to the Church. I am not the mere mouthpiece of a faith, unchanged and unchanging, once delivered to the saints, as though that faith were a precious treasure-deposit that must be preserved intact and handed on from one generation to another. That would indeed degrade both the faith and its ministers. Surely, if we hear in the Bible the eternal voice of God, speaking to our age as clearly as He spake in ages past, then let us beware that we do not take the limited vision of a past age and attempt to bind it upon our age as though the voice of God had finally spoken and the Oracle was sealed. When I affirm that "I do believe the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments to be the Word of God, and to contain all things necessary to salvation", I affirm it in all reverence and humility, deeply conscious of my responsibility as a spiritual interpreter. The Word of God, for which we stand, is a faith that is eternally reliable but never seen in the same perspective

from age to age, and consequently cannot be expressed in the spirit of yesterday. Revelation is not limited to one time or place or people, but is a continuous process, a progressive awakening in the soul of man that comes to him through the passing of the ages in those hero spirits whom love of God has blessed. The thing that is ever changing is Opportunity. New occasions are teaching us new duties. "Greater things than these shall ye do." We are only now at the beginning of an immense development and if today our prophets are pointing us to a new vision of the Gospel—woe is me if I preach not that Gospel!

It is the high destiny of the Christian Church to be the ideal Society, or at any rate, the leaven of Society, breaking down barriers that men have erected against the spirit of fellowship. This may not seem to be true of the trend of the Church in the intolerance of past ages, yet the inevitable consummation of the spirit of the Gospel permits of no other interpretation. Now, as I know that Gospel and that great organization, the Christian Church, as the mouthpiece of that Gospel, I would say with the magnificent abandon of St. Paul: "It is no longer I that live, but the Christ that liveth in me!" With such devotion must the Church inspire her cause. But it sometimes happens that the Church as an institution of Society, failing to follow her own high destiny, may fall behind in the onward march of Man, become too much interested in one phase of her mission, settle down into a smug and complacent attitude that crystallizes and hardens her teaching into cold formulas, and continue to live with no higher mission than to preserve herself as an organization and direct all her efforts to that end. We have seen the Church under that spell. We have only to read the appeals to the churches in the Book of Revelation to know that this fact has had to be reckoned with from the very beginning. But it oftentimes happens that just when the Church is safest in this security of her spiritual preroga-

tive, just at that moment some obscure prophet catches a new vision of the Divine Personality and a voice cries out upon her: "See the Christ stand!" This I would maintain—and it is sufficiently evidenced in every great reform that has come to the Church—that the Divine Personality of the Christ has ever been adequate in the history of the world to awaken the sluggishness or complacency of the Church and raise up new prophets of a new social order. It was so in the days of Luther, it was so in the days of John Wesley, it was so in the days of Maurice and Kingsley. "Lo, I am with you alway!"

"For Christ and the Church", then, may reasonably be our slogan for spiritualizing Democracy. In the spirit of that declaration we enter the church for worship, in order that we may show forth "not only with our lips, but in our lives", the Gospel of the Christ to this day and generation. In this worship, then, we are to bring before God the real needs, not only of ourselves, but our community, be it family, church, city or nation, and the aspiration of our hearts is to find expression and answer in the hallowing of all branches of life. How far are we prepared to make this worship the expression of the social gospel? We are better prepared than we are apt to think. It becomes, first of all, a matter of interpretation. There is to be no break with the expressions of worship that are dear to us. We have but to turn to the great means that the Church has found fitting in the expression of aspiration and use these means anew to express the Gospel of social salvation.

Now the means that the Church has found most fitting in the expression of her worship are as elementary as the human race. They were born in the very beginnings of the soul life of man. They came to make speech more effective, and they speak through all the ages with a stronger and more enduring voice than all orators and writers. It is sufficient to say that the written or spoken word is yours as far as you care to accept it, or, having

ears to hear, you may never catch a word of it. But the voice that speaks in symbolism through a ceremonial, that voice has a message for you. Something of that message becomes a part of you, for it overwhelms you with its emotional tenderness, it delights you with its appeal of beauty, it creates all around you an atmosphere that you cannot escape. You may resent it, if you will, but you cannot ignore it. The very message of the Gospel is pictured out before you in the architecture of the building, in the symbols that make up the interior decoration, in the vestments of the ministers, the postures of the congregation. You are a part of that in which you partake.

The Christian Church teaches primarily by symbols, pictured parables of the Presence of God. She emphasizes two means of sharing in the life of God and she designates them sacraments, outward and visible signs of the inward and spiritual grace of God, imparted always through the medium of human fellowship, represented by the necessary participation of an assembled congregation. The sacrament of Baptism, which has ever been considered the ceremony of reception into the Christian Church, speaks this social message: It is the reception of a new member into the congregation of Christ's flock, which appears to the exalted social sense as a great universal brotherhood, the expression of the love of God revealed in Christ. Moreover, it names the individual by name and consecrates him to God and the brotherhood. It is an acknowledgment, on his part, of his sonship and a pledge of his acceptance of the responsibilities that come with that acknowledgment. Of the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, Archbishop Cranmer well expressed its social significance when he said: "We see by daily experience that eating and drinking together maketh friends and continueth friendship; much more ought the table of Christ move us so to do." That communion must be something more than the individual partaking of Christ. It is the expression of Society itself, redeemed by Christ in all its human

relations, sharing in the life of God with the consciousness that that Society belongs to the Christ and partakes of His spirit. In the strength of that imparted life Society recognizes its task as the regeneration of mankind through human efforts and relationships, and that means fellowship with Christ and partaking of His passion for the Kingdom.

Let no one raise a voice of protest against form in worship. Form is the sincerest and most reverent approach through symbol to reality. Let him not raise his voice in protest against ritual. Ritual is the active participation of the body in the effort to give the soul an acceptable expression. It is not form but formalism, not ritual but ritualism, that offends. It is the "ism" that takes the heart out of the symbol and makes it the end in itself. The psychology of worship of the Protestant Episcopal Church makes that Church primarily a teaching Church. I venture the assertion that the Churches of Christendom that have made the deepest impression upon the hearts of the people and have held them to definite teaching have been the Churches that have used freely form and ceremony as the basis of their teaching. There is no mistaking the meaning of a ceremonial. It finds its way to your heart and demands some response.

IV

As a religious institution, then, we have these forms and ceremonies for the very practical purpose of transmitting through a reverent and intelligent mechanism, if you please, the inculcation of spiritual desires. Those spiritual desires have been too introspective in the past and too little concerned with human relations. Today we seek a unity in our aspirations for social ideals. Where shall we find that unity?

That unity has ever been the great goal in the search for truth in all ages. Naturally, at first, it found its expression in the individual. Rousseau's "Social Contract"

theory expresses the modern conception of that ideal. Society, it says, originated in a voluntary contract for self-preservation. The individual stood absolutely alone in the world and had to come to terms with the world about him. That idea persists throughout all generations. It has been succeeded by the ideal of the family as the social unit; then of the tribe or the state. Today we seek to find the unit of social expression in the ideal of the nation. St. Paul expressed this ideal in his twofold citizenship when he said, "Our commonwealth is in Heaven", and "I am a Roman born".

"He did not consider", says Bishop Brent, in a recent sermon, "that his loyalty to the heavenly commonwealth cancelled or impaired his nationality. It heightened and gave it new importance. Nationality, next to personality, is our precious birthright or else, in some cases, a crowning treasure acquired by choice. It may be that some of us, who have won our nationality at great cost, value it even more than many who accept it as a birthright. However that may be, nationality is something a man demands for himself and from which he cannot separate himself except by a violence which leaves him hardly human."

This ideal of the nation as the social unit is nothing new in the history of the world. It is familiar to us in the pages of the Old Testament, in the history of the Hebrew people. It is the identity of Religion with Patriotism. This may seem a strange and startling company in which to introduce Religion, but no actual incongruity is involved. We have been so long accustomed to associate Patriotism with a blind closing of the eyes to unpleasant facts in our national life that we have considered unpatriotic any one who preferred truth to patriotic illusions.

You will realize how much we have centered our Social Ideals in our nation if you consider the light in which you view yourself as an American citizen. Is there not an added dignity and worth that comes to you from the consciousness that you share in the life of a nation that is working out in the world the ideals of Democracy? Is not this the very essence of your patriotism? And do you not, in reality, worship the spirit of your country, accept-

ing its influence upon your life and character, and gratefully acknowledge that you have neither eyes to see nor lips to speak except as your nation gives you utterance? And do you not idealize our heroes, such as Washington and Lincoln, calling upon all men to revere them as types of the ideal American citizen? "America herself", as Stanton Coit says, "is a psychic sphere of creative energy, enveloping her citizens", an organic unit of spiritual life. The individual citizen of the nation blends creatively into a peculiar compound, producing an individuality that represents a unique quality—the American mind—as distinct as any individual, and differing from any other national mind as surely as Lincoln differed from Bismarck.

Under the social emphasis of the Gospel, then, we are to consider the whole life of man as essentially religious and every human activity as the expression of his relationships as sharing in the redemptive work of Christ. This makes that sphere of just relations between man and man which we call Politics a very vital part of our religion. If this be considered a sordid thing and very much removed from the province of Religion, it can only be because we have been too neglectful of the real spiritual ends of our Democracy. We have failed to use our spiritual privileges and civic responsibilities as the obligations of morality and religion demand. And why? Because there has been no unit of social expression that the citizen could assert. Certainly it is true that the great mass of citizens would have our political life fairer than it is, more expressive of our ideals, and more truly representative of that high devotion and loyalty to our country that inspires us. But we cannot bring our ideals to a focus except in one way—War! We see how this call to arms unifies a nation's sentiment and brings it to a focus and makes every individual one with the nation in purpose and ideal. But the problem before us is, how to make the arts of peace thrive with as much spiritual fervour as the arts of war. How often do you, as a citizen in this nation of ours, consciously

give yourself in some act of self-sacrifice that involves all the personal risk and submission, the hardness of deprivation and loss, that war would demand of you—how often do you, in times of peace, make religious work the sacrificial devotion of yourself to the Social Ideal of your nation? In War, you will say, the issue is clearly defined. In Peace it is diffused and abstract. In War the emotions are overwhelmed and centered upon one thing, and this is not possible in the problems of Peace. But Religion holds the key to this mystery, for it is through the offices of Religion, with their pictured vividness and continual repetition of some great social truth that means the salvation of Society, that the overwhelming emotion of God in His World may so create a national mind devoted to the fellowship of the common life that that nation shall be just as intently zealous for the common good as it was for the delusions that brought war upon it. In this way it must be "that government of the people, for the people, and by the people" not only "shall not perish from the earth" but, most important of all, shall be progressively realized upon this earth. For this we pray in "Thy Kingdom come!"

In his book, *The Soul of America*, Dr. Stanton Coit points the way towards the attainment of that unity of Social Ideals in our nation. Here is outlined in clear and telling forcefulness the problem of Democracy to inspire the people to their tasks, to make the soul of America the unit of social expression, to take into the worship of our churches the problems of our citizenship and envisage them before us through the means of religious worship, through hymns and prayers and anthems and sermons and ritual expressive of that spiritual point of view that can be pictured before us only through the high intensity that religion gives to worship. The basis of Dr. Coit's religious expression finds voice in the religion of Humanity, God as identified with the moral genius of humanity, and consequently, for the citizens of this country, identi-

fied with the soul of America. To us, as Christian people, the vitality of religion comes through the sense of the personal God outside ourselves with whom we enter into communion. That is the absolute essential of our religion. There is ever there the supernatural element and the sense of mystery, and we are given the power of interpreting that mystery to our fellows, with God as our great Companion and Guide. This is a personal mystical experience —true, but its validity and value belong to the realm of poetic truth rather than phenomenal fact, and call into play the highest faculties of the mind. This is our faith. Here we take our stand. We cannot do otherwise. But is that faith so weak that it will not bear analysis, and should we refuse to heed the voice of a prophet simply because he may speak in different terms than ours? There is no theological hatred in his expression; there is positive self-assertion of the highest type and a spiritual fervour that appeals. "In the unity of the spirit, the bond of peace and righteousness of life", you must say: "My spirit to yours, dear brother!" It may be, however, that because of the theological barriers that keep us apart we shall refuse to listen to him. But let us beware that we stone not the prophets. "Happy the land that knoweth its prophets before they die!"

In our own Church we have given scant courtesy and consideration to the prophets of Social Ideals. We remember but faintly the great work of Maurice and Kingsley, and hardly more than thirty years have passed away since Dean Fremantle delivered the Bampton Lectures on *The World as the Subject of Redemption.* Yet he spoke of the same obligation and pointed out to our own Church the possibilities and opportunities that were demanded of us by this age, and we have forgotten his utterance. Read a few words of this Anglican Prophet of the Social Gospel.

"The ideal of the Greek was versatility; . . . that of the Roman, Imperial power; . . . that of Israel, Righteousness. . . .

"The ideal we seek in modern times is that of a national community knit together in all its relations by righteousness and love, and caring especially for its weaker members. This neither Greece nor Rome did, but only the Jewish nation. Let those who would make Christianity merely a religious system apart from the common life of men, those who ascribe to it a sacerdotal or a dogmatic basis, those who conceive of God as apart from human relations, and of religion as merely individual connexion with Him, see to it that they do not fall below the Hebrew ideal. Those who appreciate that ideal most fully, and dwell most on the divine element pervading it, will see very clearly that it points to none of these as its proper development, but to an all-embracing society, including the whole range of human interests and binding all men and classes together in true relations, which are the work and the expression of the Spirit of God. . . .

"Those who have prayed together, and have been stirred by Christian exhortation and have banded themselves together in the Sacrament for the service of God and Man, rise from their knees with the question, 'What are we to do to bring about a better state for which we have prayed?' The answer to this has often been: Let us give to the poor and do the seven acts of mercy. But all such acts of mercy, to be effectual, go forth into wider and wider circles. The efforts to diminish poverty and disease lead direct into the sphere of politics. The wish to establish right feelings and sound relations among men is nothing, unless it reaches up to the sovereign community, and uses the national organs for its purpose." [1]

As a citizen in a Democracy, sharing in the life of the soul of America, and as a minister in the Protestant Episcopal Church in America, a Church whose psychology of worship is teaching by symbolism of form and ceremonial, I am asking the question whether this Church is not peculiarly fitted to be the exponent of this social gospel and include in her forms and ceremonies this social worship that shall express the social unit of our national idealism.

V

The conclusion of the matter is this. If there be such a necessity of our religious nature as Social Worship there must be found in this Church of ours some liturgical expression for that worship. Since the teaching of social ideals demands a far greater specialization than the average clergyman can possibly obtain, there must be some recognition of the teaching obligation of those who are doing

[1] *Bampton Lectures*, pp. 90 and 111.

this specialized work as our spiritual leaders. This certainly is radical enough and may well be thoroughly questioned before any attempts are made at definitive action. It is a demand upon an institution such as the Church that a radical change be made in her point of view regarding her office of worship and teaching. But, please observe, this is an effort at constructive change. We have been so accustomed in the past to resist change and hold tenaciously to the things that be, that, when the time of realization came, we had nothing to hold on to, the world had passed beyond us and resistance was no longer possible. Here is an attempt to formulate a definite working plan of action in accordance with the most reverent spirit, the earnest thought, and enthusiastic aspirations of the day we live in. It is an aim at a purposive change rather than that undirected and unplanned spasmodic change which will be forced upon us by the upheaval of circumstance when we suddenly discover that the tide is far beyond us and we are left high and dry.

Here is a very practical question of ethical decision that confronts the individual who seeks a purposive change in any institution: "Can the Church promote social ideals in her people unless her leaders set the example of loyal obedience to her own law and order?" The question answers itself as a self-evident proposition.

"The public power of all societies", says the judicious Hooker, "is above every soul contained in the same societies, and the principal use of that power is to give laws unto all that are under it; which laws in such case we must obey, unless there be reason showed which may necessarily enforce that the Law of Reason or of God doth enjoin the contrary."[2]

We must obey the laws for they set before us directive rules and constrain us to obey them by the social power that made them. And so the law depends ultimately for its enforcement upon personal recognition and public opinion. The question, therefore, resolves itself into a

[2] *Ecclesiastical Polity*, Bk. I, Chap. XVI, sec. 5.

question of the interpretation of law, for it happens that the social mind is continually progressing beyond the written law. To judge of law, therefore, is the weightiest thing any man can take upon him.[3] For the conservative, loyal to his community, holds to the original interpretation, and the liberal, in the same spirit of loyalty, holds to a liberal interpretation. The best way, then, to get at the working principle of a clause would be to read between the lines; consider the actual making of the enactment, the committee reports, the debates and all the kindred minds that entered into the final draft. Thus one may fairly know what may be called the conscience of the community to which he owes allegiance and loyalty.

Consider, first, then, this question of liturgical expression. How far is the conscience of the Church ready to go in taking up the social ideals of the day into her worship? How may any necessary change be brought about?

We have, in this Church of ours, as the basis of our liturgical expression, The Book of Common Prayer. That Book needs no commendation in these days. Its beauty of diction and spirit of dignity and reverence have been the theme of the appreciation of the literary and spiritual geniuses of our modern world. This Book did not spring full-grown into existence, but had its many and long vigils of trial and error and weary struggle with men's hardness of heart, their bigotry and superstition, before it finally came forth as it is today. The history of the compilation of this Book tells the story and makes clear for us the principles that should guide us in seeking an expression of that which our fathers had not experienced with the vividness that has come to us today. The necessity is laid upon us to find adequate expression in the offices of the Church for the development of Social Worship. Yet we have been so fearful of change, with its newness and strangeness, that we have been very jealous

[3] Aristotle, *Ethics* X, c. 10; Hooker, Bk. I, Chap. XVI, sec. 2.

of our treasure and have forgotten the fact that this Book itself was the venture of a daring faith on the part of its compilers and was never intended to bind us to forms and ideas that had been discarded by our own age. We must then declare the necessity for a more liberal and elastic use of the Book in order that the ideas and worship of this day and generation may find a voice through its medium. The Book sets before us the highest standard of literary excellence and spiritual earnestness. We must meet that demand first of all, if we expect to win the Church to the necessity of change. We must therefore call upon and welcome to our need the highest literary ability. If this be the demand of our hearts the response will come from poets, philosophers and writers of various phases of human interest. See how much appreciation went forth to the *Prayers of the Social Awakening* by Dr. Walter Rauschenbush. They have met a real need in our desire for Social Worship. But inevitably we are going to measure every attempt by the standard of the Book of Common Prayer. So it must be. When Dr. James Martineau issued his *Common Prayer for Christian Worship*, in 1861, he said of his effort:

> "How little—especially at first—it can satisfy the feeling and the ear trained by the English Church Service, I am well aware. It is far from satisfying my own. But, perhaps, after a number of faithful and reverent attempts of this kind, some higher result than is yet in sight may be worked out, and the aspiration for a pure and comprehensive worship be realized."

Another principle that must be recognized is that the compilation of this Book, and in fact of all the greatest and best of religious literature, has been by the appropriation and adaptation of old material, suiting it to the modern expression and preserving its spirit under the new forms. This means that we must be free to take from the literature of aspiration, whatever its source, the quotations that fit the necessities of our faith.

We must be free then to interpret rubrics and canons (with the recognition of proper restrictions, of course)

in order that there may be tried out, here and there in all parts of the country, the various efforts at making Social Worship a reality to the people of our nation. Be assured that there will come forth many crudities and absurdities. This is inevitable, and we must be prepared to accept the worst in the spirit of the social aspiration that utters it. But be assured also that there will come out of the efforts the consensus of worship that shall be the expression of the finest spirits, and we can possess our souls in patience for that day. By reasonable trial we shall work out these social aspirations into more definite and beautiful forms that shall be worthy of place beside the ancient symbols.

With the settlement of the liturgical expression of social ideals upon some sort of reasonable basis, may we not consider the prophetic office of the ministry as needing a wider interpretation than we have permitted? May we not consider that those earnest, sincere and gifted men and women, who are the leaders today in the great work of social redemption, practical students in sociology, have something to give our people of their social vision, for which the average minister has not the opportunity? Are they not, in very truth, Pastors, in the good Biblical sense of "Shepherds of the People", and sharers in the prophetic ministry of the Church? Some provision must be made to give them their voice in the pulpits of the Church. Do you fear that this would make of the Church a mere lecture hall? Not so. The imparting of their vision creates something more than a lecture, surrounded by all the reverent dignity and beauty of worship that the Church has found most fitting in the expression of the aspirations of the Democracy; its value is enhanced; it becomes a spiritual message to the soul of the community. The Church has a share in the solution of these unsolved social problems, but she must know them intelligently in order to awaken the people, and to act the part of a wise guide and leader she must always be in the lead. Let us

interpret our laws then to give this leadership to the Church. We have a canon that would define the rights of the congregation to authoritative teaching. What speaks the conscience of the Church in the terms of Canon 20? Briefly, it specifies such an effort as is here contemplated as a "special occasion" and does not consider it a regular service of the Church. So let it be recognized. And as to the prophetic voice, certainly the "Christian man" does not exclude woman, and means, we are all agreed, one who in his professed doctrine holds to the essentials of Christianity as this Church hath received the same, the acceptance of the Christian conception of God in the terms of the doctrine of the Trinity and especially the divinity of Christ. This preserves the theological teaching from confusion. The same rule, it is reasonable to say, would not be applied to a sociological interpretation of life. We would not demand of such a prophet an examination of his theological concepts and exact agreement with our own. We are still permitted to recognize in him as a "Christian man", one who in character and conduct exemplifies the principles of Christianity as popularly accepted. Here, at any rate, is a working principle that does not endanger our theological basis at all, but gives us wide scope of action in heeding the voice of the prophets of today. Finally we submit our sincerity and judgment in these matters to our Diocesan for his authority. We can only hope that his decision will always be in accordance with the conscience of the Church and the reverent spirit of worship that should animate the soul of every one of us.

I see this practical result growing out of this stirring of the nation's soul in Social Worship. I see a new apologetic for the faith and a new appeal for allegiance and loyalty to the Church. I would quote again from Dean Fremantle's *Bampton Lectures:*

"Christianity is to be regarded as a life, not as the holding of a series of propositions. This does not imply that it is without prin-

ciples, for how can any good life exist without principles? But first, it means that the principles which lie at the roots of the Christian life are too deep for exact definitions. As Aristotle said in reference to all moral subjects, we must make things clear according as the subject matter admits."[4]

If the Church could give this vision to men through her offices of worship, if these prayers of the saints might soar forth to God as the incense, bearing the burdens of our social conscience, would we not know more definitely the will of God for Society, and in the strength of that spiritual contact go forth to do battle more directly and more intelligently with the elements that war against the life of Society? Is not this the God whom we worship, revealed by Christ to the soul of man? Dare we demand more than this in the way of intellectual assent of any man? Is not that the faith that best interprets to any man the law of his own being? If we shall show forth in our lives what we have said with our lips, shall it not be that we too shall be overwhelmed by that passion for the Kingdom that possessed the Christ, and shall not that ever stand as the mark of a Christian?

"I would know any man as a Christian", said our own Phillips Brooks, "rejoice to know any man as a Christian, whom Jesus would recognize as a Christian, and Jesus Christ, I am sure, in those old days recognized His followers even if they came after Him with the blindest sight, with the most imperfect recognition and acknowledgment of what He was and of what He could do."

In that spirit surely, if we have so learned the mind of Christ, we may begin to understand that fellowship is heaven and fellowship is life, and the assembling of ourselves together in the name of Christ must increase and strengthen that bond of fellowship which is the warp and woof of Democracy. For this mutual sympathy and understanding comes first and what form Democracy shall take as an expression of political life is a secondary consideration. As Henry Sidgwick put it:

"I think, therefore, that what is really essential to the modern conception of a State, which is also a Nation, is merely that the

[4] P. 362.

persons composing it should have a consciousness of belonging to one another, of being members of one body, over and above what they derive from the mere fact of being under one government."[5]

This "consciousness of belonging to one another"—that is the test, or, as Elijah the prophet might have said it: "The God that answereth by fellowship, let Him be God!" We have not forsaken the ideal of worship that impelled us in seeking the salvation of the individual soul, but we have enlarged and broadened that seeking into the salvation of the soul of Society, and this Social Worship impels us to bring before God these aspirations of our social as well as individual life. We are not establishing a new Religion or founding a new Church. Whatever be the society or church that may claim us, we turn to that body with a grateful sense of loyalty, for "we are members one of another". We are seeking a unit of expression of our common loyalty and while we seek and wait, we shall bear in patience the while the reverent conservatism, the cold indifference and the blind narrowness that at times makes progress in the awakening of social vision so difficult of attainment.

Just as the individual in a Democracy must learn to co-operate with himself as a citizen, so, out of this experience he must also learn to perceive the weakness or sense the unreality and to distinguish the great from the trivial in the emphasis of Social Worship. I would maintain, therefore, that as a social institution the Church has learned wisdom and discretion in her guidance of Humanity, and in conforming to her formulas and interpreting them in the spirit of the social emphasis of the Gospel, this Social Worship is doing a constructive work for the Church of tomorrow. It is saving the Church from the time when men shall say that the Bread of Life is no longer to be found in the Church and turn to other sources for

[5] Elements of Pol., chap. 14.

the way to their salvation. Against that day we pray—"Good Lord, deliver us!"

St. Paul's Church,
Newport, Kentucky.

John Dury: A Peacemaker Among the Churches

By Newman Smyth, D.D.

Among the pamphlets and books of past controversial divinity which now rest in peace together on the shelves of historical libraries are to be found several written by a man who describes himself in these words: "Having first dealt with my own side, and gotten their consent unto this aim, I have offered myself unto the rest as a Solicitor of the Councils of Peace, and a Servant of the Communion of Saints in this matter." As one glances at the contentious titles and reads many of these once heated discussions, he may wonder why these books have not long since been consumed from internal combustion. But amid that strife of tongues, what was this solicitor of peace saying? What counsels of peace, which were then unheeded, may be waiting for fulfilment now?

In the preface to a book entitled *A Model of Church Government*, he describes himself as "John Dury who hath travelled hitherto in the work of peace among the Churches". This peacemaker had been born and baptized into the Church militant. His father was a Scotch minister who is said to have been an athlete as well as preacher—a stalwart Presbyterian, who once prayed the Lord either to convert or confound the Duke of Guise. He had been banished and compelled to find refuge in Holland when John Dury was a lad nine years of age. His grandfather in early life was a monk, who had been suspected of heresy, and was once ordered to be shot—a fate which he escaped because some one else was shot

in his place. He became a Presbyterian minister, and a fearless supporter of Knox. From such heredity, and retaining doubtless some memories of those times of his father's persecutions, John Dury appears as a peace-maker among the Churches of the Reformation. As we read his narrative of his travels in the work of peace, and consider his tireless activities, we can realize how the strength and fearless spirit of his ancestry were required, and did not fail him, in his lifelong devotion to the task which he had set himself to accomplish.

He was ministering in quietness to a congregation of British merchants in Elbing, Prussia, when the call came to him to enter upon his arduous life-work. There a Doctor Godemann, who was a civil magistrate and a Privy Councillor of Gustavus Adolphus, opened to him the opportunity by inviting him to co-operate in the effort to secure ecclesiastical peace among Protestants. It is interesting to note that the initiative of his efforts for the reunion of the Churches came thus to him from a layman, possibly at the suggestion of the King of Sweden himself. Dury writes as follows concerning it:

"The first inducement which bound my conscience was the call which I had to think upon the same, which I could not but answer, except I should have been wanting to my duty in the ministry of the Gospels. Therefore as I was provoked to think upon the Object of Faith and Truth I thought others would be moved in like manner to do the same. . . . The second inducement was the necessity of the times to heal the breaches of the Protestant Churches which we are all bound to pray for, and I in my simplicity did think what I am bound to sue for unto Almighty God, I ought also to use my best endeavours, so far as God doth enable me, to promote."

What results might follow if we all had more of Dury's kind of simplicity in our repetitions of prayers concerning our "unhappy divisions"! Lacking our "best endeavours", are they prayers? Dury writes further:

"I came to this resolution that I made a Vow of perseverance in the Worke, whether I perceived any reasonable furtherance of the Worke or no, in respect that I conceived it to be a necessary Duty, when the event did depend on God's special Providence."

The spirit in which he entered upon this mission of reconciliation shines forth from these words which he wrote a few years later:

"As for myself my whole work is to judge of mine own ways how to keep them pure and without offense towards all, how to hold forth the Word of Life, and thereby to stir up every one to follow the example of Christ Jesus, by walking in love as he hath loved us, and in holiness as he is holy, and how to follow peace and reconcile differences, which are destructive of Church and State, in a Gospel way, chiefly when God doth open a door of opportunity unto me, and this is all that I am to meddle with in my place and calling, and as I hope without human respects and worldly ends never to be wanting to this; so beyond this line, no consideration, no man nor thing, God willing, shall ever draw me."

After gaining promise of support from the King of Sweden, and from several divines, Dury went to England to secure the aid of English prelates. There Charles I., influenced by Archbishop Abbott and Laud, who at that time was Bishop of London, received him favourably. They gave him permission, so he says, "to go over into Germany to try by private negotiation how far in the worke of Ecclesiastical Pacification matteres might be ripened and brought about to a settled correspondency and consultation in that matter betwixt the churches". Armed with letters from certain divines in England "who desired, not only for their own part, to further so good and holy a purpose, but also to entreat others to join with them in it", he went back to the continent. A narrative which was written by Dury himself gives *A brief Relation of what John Dury hath prosecuted in the Worke of Ecclesiastical Pacification in Germany since the latter end of Julie 1631 till September 1633.* This narrative, as condensed as a diary, witnesses to his indefatigable activity, his many interviews and conferences, his correspondence with rulers and chancellors, and princes, as well as with divines throughout Europe. Place after place, and name after name of important personages, follow one another in this relation. Summarily also their opinions and measure of co-operation are set down

in these crowded pages. The amount of physical labour, to say nothing of intellectual tax, which is shown by this narrative, indicates that Dury must have been a man of indomitable purpose as well as exhaustless vitality. A single instance must suffice. He had been disappointed in not finding the King of Sweden where he had expected him to be, and he writes:

"Knowing that his coming was uncertain . . . I resolved to follow the King, and took the first opportunity of some soldiers going that way. . . . With much difficulty and toil, we came to Wittenberg in Saxony, but the King had fought the battle of Leipsick, and gone towards Erford, therefore I made haste to follow him with the first company that went; but before I could overtake him he had come to Wirtzberg and had taken the castle there by assault. There I was admitted to him about the latter part of October."

Gustavus Adolphus, having approved the scope and the means of his undertaking, promised to give him "Promotorial Letters towards all Evangelical States and Princes of the Empire to testify unto them his earnest desire to set forward so good an undertaking and to entreat them to set their ablest Divines to join with me in it". He speaks of the "extreme difficulties of war on all sides"; and though the "purpose of general meetings had failed by reason of invincible difficulties and straits of these times", nevertheless he sought to do what might be done in private with each one in preparation for "the work against a better and happy season". He writes:

"While I was bethinking myself how to extend the work further . . . the dolefull news [of the death of the King of Sweden] afflicted us all, which affliction was redoubled by a second blowe in the losse of the King of Bohemia. These great changes brought a great stop to all deliberations, yet the worke being God's rather than man's, we trusted him."

And true to his vow of perseverance he travelled hither and thither, letting no opportunity escape him to forward his undertaking. He sought aid in all the universities and eminent churches in Germany. After having provided how the business should be followed in time to come when he should be absent, he writes:

"I took shippinge at Flushinge, and arrived here prosperouslie at London on the 8th of this month of November for which I praise the Lord to whom bee all thankes and glorie forever and ever Amen."

In order that he might represent the Episcopal Church in the further prosecution of his undertaking, he received additional ordination in the cathedral of Exeter in 1634, without renouncing his previous ordination, and "with the imposition of hands of several other presbyters together with himself". In so doing he seems to have anticipated the act of John Humfreys, a Congregational minister of London, in 1678, who was willing to receive Episcopal ordination on the express understanding that he did not renounce his previous ordination, but accepted it as conferring additional jurisdiction, his previous ordination being *in foro Deii*, the second *in foro Ecclesiae Anglicanae.*

Dury made two other journeys to the continent; then we find him back again in England in 1640, where notwithstanding the unfavourable conditions of the times, he presented a petition to the House of Commons, entreating "that the blessed and long sort-for union of Protestant Churches might be recommended unto the publick prayers of the Church". He was a member of the Westminster Assembly in 1645; and there with Baxter and others he endeavoured to promote the reconciliation of parties and the removal of differences. He made another journey in 1654-57, chiefly among the Reformed Churches of Switzerland, Germany, and Holland. At the Restoration Dury endeavoured again to prosecute his work, but on account of his previous relations with Cromwell he found no favour with Charles II and his Lord Chancellor Hyde. Consequently, he retired to Hesse Cassel, where he continued his work as a "Counsellor of peace", until he was overtaken by the last and only enemy to whom he yielded; he died in 1680.

From this mere sketch of his lifelong work we turn to his writings to learn more particularly his principles and

methods. One cannot read the forgotten pamphlets and letters of this man, of whom the Church historians have taken little note, without thinking what a modern man he was, and what a Church statesman, and great reconciling Christian he would be if living among us now. The following are some of his words for us.

He foresaw that one of the lamentable consequences of the divisions of his time would be that "we shall be habituated to these breaches"; and we now have become so habituated to them that we seem quite generally content to offer prayers without our best endeavours for their answers, or confession of the sin of our breaches of the wholeness of Christ's Church. Dury's writings contain passage after passage concerning "the scandalous and unconscionable effects of our present distempers", for which some cure ought to be found. Not to overfill these pages with his vigorous characterizations of the divisions of Protestantism, I will cite only the following satirical specimen:

> "We stand as a tall man distracted in his thoughts, and divided in all his resolutions, who hath no command or little use of his members, because they are all out of joint, and hang as it were loose one from another. Thus this Church, the tallest of any Reformed in Europe and fit to be a leader of the rest in the spiritual Conquest of Canaan, doth stand within itself and to others useless."

Dury was not content to be a pessimistic deplorer of irremediable evils, or a self-satisfied, destructive agitator; above all he was a constructive Church statesman. He keeps himself up to this clear note: "The true way of advancing Christianity is not destructive, but edification." His method of overcoming the divisions of the Churches is primarily personal. He is always seeking out individuals who may promote his cause. In his travels to and fro his eye was ever upon the individuals who might be made promoters of the work of reconciliation. He adopted also in his first efforts, and pursued to the end, what he calls the method of "amiable conference". Through such conferences he hopes that in matters of

differences of opinion "a tendency to regulate our thoughts and affections in the work of Reconciliation may be beaten out and cleared". He would have nothing to do with meetings for scholastic disputations. He writes:

"Except I can perceive the conference to be intended towards the use of edifying, I shall not meddle with it. That I may not be mistaken that what is intended concerns the use of edifying, I take the measure of my own and other men's aims by two Rules: the first is, that if either the matter itself is not fit to manifest some part of God's glory, or if the aim of those that handle it is not set professedly to show forth that part of the glory which the matter offers; then I conclude that the handling of it is not intended to edification. The second thing is, that if the matter and handling of it is to the end of the commandment which is charity, then I conclude that it is intended for the edification, because charity doth edify."

It is characteristic both of the man and of the times, that he lays down rules for himself in accordance with which all discussions for the end of edifying should be conducted. These rules are an excellent combination of logic and charity. He would have "an orderly way of proceeding in all doubtful matters to find the decision thereof". He deprecates the "confusions which hitherto by reason of confused means of agitation have been unavoidable". In current religious discussions this observation of Dury's is much to the point:

"Nor is there any one thing that doth more intangle and increase the multiplication of needless Debates, than the mistake of the points of difference either wilfully, or ignorantly entertained. By this means Satan doth enable and engage men's spirits to make their contentations inextricable, endless and irreconcilable; for when the question is not distinctly stated, and men are entered upon controversy, they will rather alter the point of debate twenty times, than seem to be found in error once."

He was too intent upon the one aim of unity to be drawn aside by any minor differences. He says that he did not negotiate for the decision of this or that particular opinion—"I leave all such disputes as matters of indifference to me in respect of the Scope of my negotiations". Matters more fundamental he would seek to reconcile in two ways, first, "by a fundamental confession of faith, and of duties requisite unto salvation, which might be

common to all, and openly professed as the sum and substance of our religion and badge of our fraternal union". His second rule, in conformity with the method of theological reasoning from the Scriptures then prevalent but less literal in its application, was the use of "a common and infallible rule of interpreting the text of the Holy Scriptures". In his love of unity, however, he had freed himself from the habit, which he deprecates, of maintaining differences in faith or practice by means of isolated passages, or meanings of particular words in the Scriptures. He was partially, yet not wholly, delivered from the vicious method of maintaining systems of faith or exclusive forms of Church organization by the use of selected proof-texts, although in his day the modern methods of historical and biblical criticism were not observed. Dury not only urged the method of Church unity by conferences, which of late years has been repeatedly commended by Lambeth Conferences and adopted as the next step towards unity in the present plan for a World Conference on Faith and Order; but it is also a remarkable fact that Dury anticipated by two hundred and sixty-nine years almost identically a preparatory plan for this purpose which was adopted in January of this year by representatives of the Churches of North America in a preliminary conference at Garden City. Indeed the similarity between Dury's proposals and that plan is so evident that if the two were printed in parallel columns, the authors of the latter might be accused of unconscious plagiarism. Dury, however, might rather rejoice in spirit, could he know that his plan for the peace of the Churches has at length been taken up and made substantially the programme of representatives of American Churches.

I give in a slightly abbreviated form his "Way to heal our present distempers".

"Let all parties who take the Holy Scriptures for their Rule of Faith and Practice, set forth positively and declare plainly, either

what they judge to be fundamental in matter of Doctrine and Practice, or clearly commanded for Edification, or that wherein they profess a full agreement with their Brethren. Then First, let the parties by some of their selected men (who shall do all things with their full consent and knowledge) make a Draught of the full agreement of these former Declarations, and that being imparted unto all an Acknowledgment be made concerning it in that whereunto they all have attained, and wherein they mind the same thing to edify one another in the Truth whereunto they are come.

"Secondly, let the same parties declare negatively the things wherein they conceive they disagree from each other. And when these Declarations are drawn up, let those that have perused them add their advice concerning the Ways of reconciling Differences and then let some selected men, the most Moderate of each Party, be called together to set down the joint agreement of their Advices concerning the way of reconciling Differences, and according to that Agreement, let them make a trial of reconciling the Differences, and Offer it to all, only as an Essay without prejudice to any, to be considered. Thirdly, Let the same Parties declare both positively and negatively the Rules by which they are willing to walk inoffensively towards those with whom they do not agree, and in case any offense be given or taken, How the same ought to be taken away by mutual consent. Here then the same selected men, or others, may set awork to peruse such Declarations, and gather into one Body the Rules whereunto all sides will agree to walk to avoid offenses."

Besides the method of conference Dury very early in his efforts became convinced that a good means of overcoming ecclesiastical and dogmatic differences would be to turn men's thoughts towards practical divinity. He seems to have had this very much at heart. For when he went first to England in 1631 he brought with him a letter signed by several German divines who urged the British divines, as eminently fitted for the task, to prepare a "full Body of Practical Divinity". It was in consequence of this request that Bishop Davenant published *An Exhortation to Brotherly Communion betwixt the Protestant Churches*, in which occur these words well worth quoting: "True and genuine charity is no less necessary to salvation than the true and entire profession of sound and saving faith." In the pursuit of unity Dury had come to realize more deeply than had most of his contemporaries the difference between theology and religion. He had learned in his travels that one occasion for the mischief-making "evil spirit of division"

was the predominance of scholastic theology over religion. The Church has often been tempted to make logic greater than love. To Dury the one thing most needful for the distractions of his time was the Charity which is greatest of all. It was his constant message that if men, and especially the ministry of the Church, could practise love, the divisions which imperilled Protestantism would be dried up at their source.

Although in his first visit to England he obtained promising co-operation in his plan of a body of practical divinity, the confusions of the times had prevented its completion. Several years later, in 1653, when this man, whom nothing seems to have discouraged, took up again in England this same plan, Archbishop Usher wrote to him concerning it that it was, "a work which I have long wished for, and which formerly my heart was in and my hand would have been too, if God had been pleased to continue our peace". Not succeeding in having this work done by others, Dury wrote himself a compendious sketch of what the contents should be of "A full Body of Practical Divinity, which, instead of the ordinary philosophical jangling School Divinity, might be proposed to all those that seek the truth, which is after Godliness". He had observed the dissensions which arise from ministers preaching particular things too much, and indiscreetly "overshooting themselves", in their zeal for their special parties, and he would stir up the ministry to preach rather "the main things which discover the life and spiritual estate of Christ as the Truth is in him". He would not deny the value of particulars of doctrine or practice; but more than usual then, and as is too often lacking in our discussions, he had been taught by the very necessities of his great endeavour to see things whole; or, as he himself has expressed it, he saw "the nature and property of the Worke itself as it hath Place in the kingdom of God". "This consideration", he says, "grew upon me, when I had been a cer-

tain space in action." In this connection this further admonition of his may not be wholly superfluous in denominational or church seminaries for the education of ministers.

"Their young scholars being trained up to these ways of contentious Learning, for want of better Teaching, prove in the course of their Ministry very often void of all charitableness and strangers to peaceable affections. . . . The smallest differences of opinions beget ordinarily the extremest distances of affection."

Have we never had occasion to recognize the truthfulness of Dury's characterization of some clergymen whom he had met on his travels, "who have taken up either a Superstitious and Traditional Formality, or a singular and self-conceited Spirituality of worship and Godliness"? To what an extent multiplication of sects, and of parties even within the same communion, has arisen as a consequence of a common fault of human nature, which he points out in these words: "Great disputes fall out from small matters, from whence schisms and separations at last arise in the Church."

Dury was an Oxford man, and his travels had brought him into many university circles as well as to the courts of princes and kings. He saw that one of the sources of divisions and consequent perils of the common cause of Protestantism was the disputatious habit of university teaching. Among the remedies needed he would consider "some ways of purging the Universities from the froth of contentious learning, to bring Scholars to a Demonstrative way of attaining profitable knowledge and of the exercise and employment of their Talents for the benefit of each other without envy, to increase *in infinitum* beyond the present bounds thereof".

There is an edifying method of debate urged in Dury's writings which has direct pertinency to current discussions of Church problems. Needless party oppositions and overheated arguments might be alleviated if, on both sides of the discussion which now surges around the words Protestant and Catholic, there should be generally ob-

served Dury's eirenical Rules for "a Professor of Christianity in entering into any Debate". Besides consideration of "the Worth of the Subject", and the "End of Edification", which was with him always the chief aim of discussion, he emphasizes the need, first of all, of careful inquiry concerning the point of difference, "How to state the question rightly". Unless this is done, the discussion now between "Protestant" and "Catholic" becomes a partisan dispute about names. Dury, on the contrary, as long ago as 1650, would have nothing to do with a party use of names. Hardly more than a century after the Reformation he proposed that the names which had come into vogue, such as presbyterial, prelatical, congregational, and others, should be abolished and that they should be known as the reformed Christians of England, Scotland, France, Germany, etc. It should not now be forgotten that the first reformers did not call themselves Protestants, but "Associates of the Augsburg Confession"; and in a noble passage in the *History of Protestant Theology* that great teacher of its principles, the late Prof. Dorner, vindicates the positive, spiritual principle of the Reformation. Dury's love of unity had given him clear insight into the real issues which too often are hidden beneath prevalent party use of words. He was concerned for "the common cause of Protestantism". What that meant for him in his age he describes as "(1) The Interest of Scripture Knowledge, (2) Of the Life of the Spirit, (3) Of orderly walking in all God's Ordinances Natural and Spiritual, (4) Of the Communion of the Churches in reference to mutual Edification in these forenamed matters". Well would it be for the unity and power of the Churches of the Reformation in our generation if our distinctive names should fall back into secondary distinctions; and above all considerations of differences we should place our Common Cause of Christ's Christianity for the world! At this tragic hour of history when the judgments of God among the nations

bring a new searching of heart to the Churches, this word of a prophetic spirit may come to us from that past age of the trial by fire of the Reformation: "If the common cause of Protestantism be made anything else than the Propagating of the Light of the Gospel, it is foully mistaken."

It may be said that Dury was a man of one idea, but it was a great idea; and it is noteworthy how in the light of one luminous Christian idea he was enabled to follow a steady and consistent course through the revolutionary changes of those troublous times. He made his vow of devotion to the common cause of Protestantism in the later, most devastating period of the Thirty Years' War, he continued his life work through the Civil War in England, during the period of the Commonwealth, and subsequently in the time of the Restoration. He followed his guiding star to the camp of Gustavus Adolphus, to the courts of different principalities, and into the presence of chancellors and kings throughout all the countries of Europe. He received encouragement from Charles I, survived the dominance of Laud; secured the support of Cromwell; and we find him still pursuing his high aim after the Restoration. That he was able to do so throughout so great vicissitudes bears witness to the supreme power of his principle, as well as to the supreme devotion of the man to his ruling idea. He did not, however, altogether escape reproach. A partisan, William Prynne, in the controversial bitterness of the period of the Commonwealth, characterized him as "The time-serving Proteus and ambidexter divine"; to which Dury replied by saying that he was "The unchanged, constant, and single-minded peacemaker". He wrote without bitterness,

"I have ever endeavoured and professed myself to be *extra partes;* and accordingly have maintained the practice of rules and principles which I made usefull alike towards all, to serve all, in the best things according to emergencies."

How clear and truthful his defence was, is evident when we read his vindication of taking the oath of alle-

giance to the Commonwealth, which is given in his pamphlet, *A case of Conscience resolved*, and in subsequent answers to scruples in that matter. He begins by restating the principles and rules of edifying discussion which he had laid down for himself in his conferences; then he seeks to apply these "according to emergencies". We will not follow him through this illuminating discussion of the obligations of allegiance to successive forms of government. His career is an example of the real consistency of a life of principle through trying changes of circumstances—of the possibility of living at any time by Christian principles which shall stand the test of all times.

A minor but interesting illustration of Dury's fidelity to his ruling idea is to be found in his discussion of another matter in his book *Concerning Meddling with State Matters*, or what in our day we should call preaching politics. While he carefully distinguishes the mutual obligations and relations of the magistrate and the minister, he does not deny the right of the minister to teach what the obligations of the magistrate are, as he would admonish other persons; but he deprecates the habit of judging as to matters properly belonging to the civil authority, and particularly of "advertizing State Matters" in the pulpit. Noticing among his numerous writings one entitled *Israel's Call to March out of Babylon unto Jerusalem*, a sermon delivered to Parliament on a day of humiliation—one of those Fast days on which ministers feel more at liberty to meddle with State matters,—I took it up and read it with some curiosity to see whether Dury had deviated from his own principles and rules. I noticed that in his prefatory response to the invitation of Parliament to have it printed, he slipped in the remark that the shortness of the time would not permit him to proceed to a full application; I found, however, in the discourse a full exposition of the relations and duties of magistrates and preachers, but there

was not a paragraph in this plain spoken enforcement of those mutual obligations which would indicate what the particular questions of State were that might then have been agitating Parliament. He "advertised" no State matters in dispute between parties, while he did not hesitate to score practices of rulers which should be condemned. For example, he says that while it is lawful to seek places,

"God hath ordained all such places, not for a private use, that a man should get into it to sit safe, and warm, and high. . . . Look to your aim which you know best."

He compares such place hunters to Shebna, who

"in a time of trouble provided for himself, and God sendeth the prophet to him to tell him that he had made his reckoning without his host; that he made account to settle himself on high, but that God would turn him down low."

One cause of party strife among Protestants he finds in their use of imperfect and worldly means. He deplores their mistake of managing Protestantism as a State religion rather than as true professors of Christianity. That way is "little relative to Charity, and either is carried on in the way of Liberty or of Authority". He warns holy men in the ministry of the danger of becoming partisans on the one side or the other in particular matters of civil government. As a Presbyterian he would apply the same higher law of charity to the government of the Church:

"The object of Classical Presbyterianism is to entertain Brotherly Conferences and Consultations about spiritual matters, for mutual Edification and support in the ways of God; and not to interfere with the Congregations in any of the particular affairs which are not voluntarily brought unto them as a Case wherein their judgment is sought; for no particular church, by its submission to a Classis, is to be deprived of any right which it hath within itself, but is rather to be confirmed therein."

He warns ministers of the peril of using any other means in the cause of the Reformation than

"that which Christ hath used and sanctified unto them. Satan overreaches them in their Counsels of a Worldly way of Policy, because Satan is an old Master of the Trade of Policy and Power, which of late they as young prentices were beginning to take up."

In Dury's age toleration had not been accepted as a general principle of government. In the same collection in which I found his sermon on *Israel's Call*, there was another by an Oxford prelate containing an elaborate argument against religious toleration. But that traveller "in the way of love" had seen a light which was hidden from the University scholar; in it Dury had gained a more excellent view of the nature and limits of the supreme authority of the State. He said of his own hope for the peace of the Church:

"I did not aim so much at a bare Toleration betwixt us and the Lutherans, as at a public profession of Brotherhood whereupon I conceived a Toleration would follow of itself in matters of less difference which would be no just occasion of offense."

Having thus learned a more excellent way than bare Tolerance in the Church, he gained also a more just and liberal view of the relations between Church and State. Though as others he fell back upon the power of the State for the regulation of outward observances of religion, he maintained that

"the law should be serviceable to the common good, and in emergencies, if no positive law be extant to determine the circumstantial way of using power and authority, then the general law of Nature and Christianity is to take place; which is the law of liberty. . . . This law is, give no occasion to the flesh, but by love serve one another; and the rule of this service is, whatever you would have others do to you, do ye the same likewise."

After a long life of fifty years of devoted labours, his travels were ended, and Dury found a resting-place in his old age at Cassel; yet in his retirement there, apart from his friends, he continued his endeavours by writing letters to the universities and men of eminence in behalf of the union of the Reformed and Lutheran theologians. Among the encouragements which he once said had strengthened him against straits and oppositions were "the counsels of the chief statesmen that were rational and prudent in the ways of true government". But to the end he found among the theologians irreconcilable differences, and though some sent appreciative replies to

his letters, others decidedly rejected his appeals. Among them he had sown the good seed on stony ground. So at the close of his prolonged life-work of fifty years he seems to himself to have spent his strength in vain. A few years before he died he wrote to the Princess of Cassel:

"The principal fruit which I have received from all my toil is that from without I see the misery of the Christians, which is very much greater than that of the pagans and the other nations; I see the cause of that misery, I see the defect of the remedy, and I see the cause of that defect; I have no other reward than the testimony of my conscience."

Was such a life spent in vain? Unpractical in his time his aims may have seemed to be; but does he fail who sees and follows ideals beyond his time? It is given to one to sow, and another generation shall reap. Once before, midway in his career, when some of his labours had come to naught, Dury had written:

"Although my earnest and constant solicitations have not been so effectual as I could wish, yet I must bless God that they have not been altogether without effect; for although there is not much appearing outwardly yet some grounds are laid which I am confident the gates of Hell shall not be able to shake."

In this nobler confidence, and with a good conscience, though without signs of the fruit of his labours, in his eighty-fifth year he entered into his rest. He had kept the vow of his youth. With singleness of mind he had been true to his aim. Through wars in the world, and amid strife of tongues in the Church, he had walked in "the way of doing all things in love": for he saw a better country, and he died in faith, not having received the promises, but having greeted them from afar. He being dead yet speaketh; and not he alone. Others have caught his spirit. In every generation since there have been some, like him, who have sought the peace of the Church and pursued it. Into their labours we have entered. Their prayers are our heritage; the fruits of their devotion are within reach of our hands; the harvest of their sowing is already white for us to reap.

Shall this generation pass away until these things be fulfilled? After the greatest war of history the world will be ready for the greatest triumph of Christianity. Shall there be one Church of God on the earth with faith equal to this coming day of the Lord? For this the preparation now required through all our divided Churches is first of all the mutual confession of our common sin of continued schism.

THE
CONSTRUCTIVE
QUARTERLY

Incarnation

By William Porcher DuBose, M.A., S.T.D.

The question well up before us for our consent and agreement, and so as the basis of our Christian unity, is primarily that of our Christian Faith. So far as that faith is immediately connected with and rooted in the facts and acts of our Lord's human life, they are expressed for some of us in a brief series of "Proper Prefaces" in the services for Christmas Day, Easter Day, Ascension Day, Whitsunday, and Trinity Sunday. Those prefaces are all expressed in terms of the physical facts and acts of our Lord's life, birth, death and resurrection, etc. Anything that one may have to say upon any essential point of our common faith can be no more than a single aspect of a many-sided fact or truth, one's own point of view at the moment: and that is all I claim for what I have to say upon one most vital point. I will put it in the form of a discussion of the Proper Preface for Christmas Day or Season: "Because Thou didst give Jesus Christ, Thine

only Son, to be born as at this time for us; Who, by the operation of the Holy Ghost, was made very man, of the substance of the Virgin Mary His Mother: and that without spot of sin, to make us clean from all sin.Therefore, etc."

The particular, and very partial, treatment of those words which I have in view will appear to many in the light of an evasion of their literal and manifest meaning. It may just as well appear to others a far-fetched attempt, by bringing in other matter, to justify the language, and so to make possible and probable the fact or truth of the Preface. My motive is neither of these but simply the following: The doubts and difficulties of Christianity to-day are mainly in the natural or physical and not in the spiritual sphere whether of thought or of reality. Yet Christianity as an incarnation must needs include and cover both of those spheres. The trouble as found, for example, in the preface before us is: that, coming to us wholly in the language of the physical (which is practically our only language, even for purely spiritual things) the subject-matter, the fact or truth sought to be conveyed, is met by us on the material side and discussed and questioned by us only in the material plane. The real and whole question is not—Can a man be born of a virgin? but—Can God be born "in the flesh"? The latter is what we are called to believe and meant to believe; and if we do believe and know that God was born in the flesh and that incarnation necessitates virgin birth, then we believe the Virgin Birth. What I mean to say now is simply this: To be Christian we must believe the Incarnation: If we do believe that, in reality, we *may* (I need go no farther just here) believe the Virgin Birth. If we do not really believe that, then we *cannot* believe the Virgin Birth. Therefore to stop and attempt to settle the matter of the Virgin Birth *before* we will accept the Incarnation is an absurdity, because it attempts an impossibility.

If therefore I were coming to Christianity for the first time, and were confronted at the door with the dogma of the Virgin Birth, I should ask, "Why do you ask me to believe that"?—and if the answer was, "As part of the Incarnation"—then I should say: Let me see it in and with and as part of the Incarnation that I may believe it. What the result of such a position would be, we can only see in due course.

The accounts in Sts. Matthew and Luke of the "genesis" or human origin of Jesus are written in full consciousness of the spiritual truth and meaning of their Subject. St. Matthew has to account for the thoroughly supernatural fact of "God with us" (Immanuel) in the person of Jesus; and he sees expressed already in that human and historical name the specific and distinctive function of the Incarnation: "He it is that shall save His people from their sins". St. Luke sees in Him who is to be born the long-promised Messiah, the true David, Founder and Maker of the Kingdom of God upon earth. Both recognize in the event of Christmas Day the positive and emphatic fact of a supernatural birth—a birth that is not wholly or only "of blood, or of the will of the flesh, or of the will of man, but of God". That which was born was indeed in the highest sense to be "Son of Man"—"Man from heaven"—but so only because in a yet higher and highest sense He was antecedently "Son of God".

Both evangelists, as the accounts stand, ascribe the divine element in the birth to the operation of the Holy Ghost. It is questionable whether the name (here without the article) is limited to the Third Person of the Trinity. If we presume to distribute the divine operation in the matter, the Father is the Begetter, the Son or Word is the Seed, and the Holy Spirit is the Preparer of the soil or the womb—the principle imminent in and productive of the human conception, as of all human susceptibility and receptivity of the divine. The accounts make Faith the medium of reception and conception of the heavenly

Word: "Blessed is she that believed"! For to such "No word from God shall be void of power".

Thus all the spiritual elements and understanding of our Lord's human "becoming" are present in the accounts of the unquestionably supernatural birth. Now here, and here only in the New Testament, these are connected and bound up with certain physical or material postulates, or facts in the flesh, expressed in the terms "Virgin Birth" and deemed necessary to and inseparable from either their actuality or their comprehensibility. But, however necessitated this fact, or unanswerable the doubts raised by it, the deeper and more vital question involved is this: Are we to allow such difficulties in the plane of the flesh—however met, or whether to be met at all—to mar or lower our conception and acceptance of the supernatural in the person and work of Jesus Christ? Certainly it is only the latter, the spiritual so-called miracle, that can give any reason or credibility to the former, the physical or material. God in the person of Jesus Christ may safely dispense with any necessity of our adequate understanding of the *quo modo* of His incarnation on its physical or natural side. It is quite possible, and even actual and not uncommon, that a full, or fuller, knowledge of our Lord's personality on its spiritual and divine side will leave us comparatively and essentially indifferent to questions and difficulties of merely material interest.

Looking at the matter then, at least first, if not altogether, from above and not from below, it is fortunate for us that that is the point of view of the New Testament, outside of the passages we have been considering. It is wholly that of St. John, of St. Paul, of the writer to the Hebrews, and so of all the real construction of the doctrine of the Incarnation. Still more it is that of the Divine Human, the Incarnate Person Himself: Our Lord's claim upon us is a very human, as well as divine, one—but it is an absolutely and purely spiritual one. He proves it by What He is, not by How He came.

Returning to our Preface, we recall that the "operation" of the Incarnation on its human side is ascribed to the Holy Ghost—evidently meant there (though not in the two Gospels) in the restricted sense of the Third Person. Now, whatever may be the fact, we can form no conception or understanding of how the Holy Ghost *operated* the Incarnation physically or materially, how it changed or affected the *nature* of the assumed humanity mechanically, or otherwise than spiritually. What is the specific function of the Holy Ghost as now differentiated in our thought from those of the other Persons of the Trinity? When it was said originally that "the spirit of God moved (or brooded) upon the face of the waters" of the earth, yet "waste and void"—either we cannot limit the meaning or activity of the Spirit of God then to its functions as now understood, or else we must interpret the words somewhat as follows: The whole-loving, gracious, self-imparting nature and disposition of God was present, immanent and latent, in creation from its beginning. The function of the Holy Ghost in the world is distinctively to impart the holy spirit of God in the creature as the creature is evolved and qualified to receive and share it. Its meaning and operation, so far as now developed, is *God in us—us* as evolved from mere creatures or "things" into children, capable of consciously and freely sharing His nature and disposition, become persons like Himself, and able to fashion ourselves in His image and likeness. This reason and meaning and end of God in creation we are willing and able to find immanent and latent in it from its beginning. All the love, all the grace, all the fellowship with us which we now know in God, and can enter into and share with Him as children partakers of His being, His Nature, His life and Himself—all this we can carry back and find brooding over and entering into things from the beginning. Under the now more differentiated terms *Word* and *Spirit* we understand God as revealed or expressed alike to our reason or intelligence and to our

disposition or affections—in a word, to our mind and our heart, as the supreme End and Object of our faith and our love. Both of these conceptions must be combined in the one term *Spirit* in Genesis. God's heart as well as mind moved and brooded *over creation* from the beginning and out of the waste and void of its formless matter has evolved all its both natural and spiritual order and purpose.

But, as I have said, the term Spirit within the limits of the New Testament itself becomes restricted from *all* divine operation to that specific operation which therefore we now characterize as distinctively *spiritual*—in contrast with natural, material, or mechanical. More plainly, Spirit acts properly only upon spirit, actual or potential, and its function is the production and evolution of spirit. In this sense it may have been evolutionally at work from the beginning in the form of natural affinities, animal instincts and affections, etc., but now, as Holy Ghost, its place and part in Christianity is in the souls and not the bodies, in the personalities rather than in the impersonal nature or natural constitution of men.

We must, however, here and now, emphasize the action of the Holy Ghost as essentially *prevenient*: that is, it is cause of, and not merely consequent upon, the human motions of our own spirits. We must realize that very much apparent recognition and admission of a Holy Ghost does not really mean any operation upon or in us from an objective God, but only the subjective motions of a so-called *divinity* within us. God does operate upon us largely from within—and even, we may say, wholly *through* ourselves; but that His motions come from Him without us and above us, we must distinctly hold in order to be Christian. And, if His "Spirit" can thus come to us from Himself without and above us in or by any form of inspiration, why not equally may His "Word" come to us from without and above by some other form of self-revelation or self-communication? As I shall ask again, if there is any real inspiration in or through our hearts,

why may there not be some equally real revelation to or through our minds?

So, when we consider the operation of the Spirit, or Holy Ghost in the New Testament sense, in the act of the Incarnation, we can understand that operation only along lines which I may illustrate as follows: Some one has replied to the question, when ought the shaping of a child (i.e., its nature, disposition, or spirit) to begin?—"In the third or fourth generation before it is born". I can believe that the shaping of the human spirit of Jesus—in its preparation to become the incarnation of the Word of God—began not only as far back as Abraham, but as far back as Creation, or as God Himself. We must remember that the Advent or Coming of Christ was a process of ages before His birth. And not only so, it has, contrary to primitive (and oft-since repeated) expectation, been and will be a process of ages after His birth. Christ is synonymous with Humanity in its divine meaning, determination, and destination—whether we consider that destination generically and upon earth, or individually and personally in eternity or in heaven.

In a word, the operation of the Holy Ghost, in its proper and distinctive kind, is a work of spiritual and not of material creation; it has to do with the evolution of selfhood in the nature and not with mechanical (or *fiat*) alterations in the nature of the self. The incarnation in Christ was not effected and completed in the act of His conception and birth: those were necessary moments in it, but they were not independent of, or wholly complete without, the entire subsequent process of His perfect human life in the flesh. It was not the mere fact of His being in it, but the consummate act of what He did and was in it that made humanity in His person Son of God. To make it still shorter, the Incarnation was not the mere fact of Christ, it was the entire act of Christ in our flesh or our nature. It was not only *that* God was in our nature in Him—but *what* God was in our

nature in Him, and what our nature (in its redemption and completion) became in Him. Now in all our study of the actual part of the Holy Ghost in the incarnation in Christ in the New Testament we can find no trace of any prior change of the flesh, or the nature, for Him, but everything of the complete transformation of it—amounting to re-creation—in Him and by Him.

In the Preface then for Christmas Day, after the words "Who by the operation of the Holy Ghost was made very man"—let not the mind stop upon the physical facts of our Lord's conception and birth, but run on upon the entire act of spiritual new-birth and new-creation which was to ensue upon those facts, and of which they were secondary incidents. The "very manhood" thus assumed and begun and in which the Holy Ghost was chief agent and operant, was not yet consummated, and not to be until Itself could say upon the Cross, "It is finished"—and the Father should raise it up out of even that depth and death, and exalt it to the level with Himself. God was not fully made Man until Man was raised up into actual oneness with God. The "very" manhood, expressed and assumed by our Lord Himself in the title "Son of Man", has more meaning in it than we can realize until we shall "see Him as He is, and be made like Him".

That He was made very man "of the substance of the Virgin Mary" means that He was as very *man* in His humanity as He was also very *God* in the reality of His deity. "And that without spot of sin" does not describe any mere absence of sin from the fact of His inherited nature but freedom from sin in His entire actual and active manhood: He was author and finisher of His own sinlessness.

Finally, "To make us free from sin"—indicates such a truth of Christ in Himself and of His relation to us all, as makes Him divinely inclusive of us in Himself, and makes us potentially and progressively receptive of Him in ourselves—if we will.

But the first point in our Preface, as in any statement of Christianity, is the assumption of a pre-natal or pre-human personality of our Lord, wherein He is "in substance" one with God,—just as in His human nature He is one with our common humanity, or with our personal selves. In speaking of the divine personality of our Lord, I do not presume to interpret God, or to solve the mystery of His method in at-one-ing Himself with His creation in the person of Man as its head. My only effort shall be to assist our apprehension of a truth which in substance we hold together, while in explanation we naturally differ because any explanation, however true, is only an infinitesimal part of a divine fact.

The starting point for us of any knowledge of God must be ourselves: we are the only objects within our experience that in its nature bears the image or is made in the likeness of the personal God. St. Paul says, "When it pleased God to reveal His Son in me—". He was doubtless thinking only of the revelation of Christ, but the revelation *in me* was a very necessary part of the thought. Paul first fully and really "came to" and saw "himself" in the revelation to him of Jesus Christ: and so must we all. I repeat that first of all and most of all Christ is God's revelation to us of ourselves. The end of that revelation to St. Paul was expressed by him in the words: "No longer I—but Christ in Me"! The I was dead, but alive again; was lost, but only then truly found—in Christ. St. Paul was not thinking of himself alone, but of the self, the soul, of humanity, of man: nor of that only, but of all nature, all creation, which here at least, on earth, culminates in man and his destiny. The cosmic, and (before even that) the divine meaning and nature of Jesus Christ was, at least implicitly, all that first revelation of Him to, because in, St. Paul. If we were not in Christ in Eternity, Christ could not be in us in time.

What then was the pre-incarnate personality of Jesus? Its first designation is "Word of God": "In the beginning

was the Word, and the Word was with God and Was God"; and "the Word was made flesh and dwelt among us." With us a word is an abstraction—a sign or symbol of something which *itself* is not. A word of God *is* what it means, is all that it stands for. The word of creation was creation itself in the mind or thought or purpose and in the utterance of God. "He spake and it was made", we say; but there was no "and" between the speaking and the making. His speaking is its making. So the Word of God is in general All Things in the eternal mind or thought or utterance of God—or, reversely, The Mind, etc., of God in all things. But the "all things" for us sum themselves up in man and his life and destiny. And so we say that the Word of Christ is man and his destiny as seen in God—*sub specie æternitatis*, as well in its pre-destination as in its post-destination. But this supreme and only Word of God is no divine abstraction like our thoughts and words; it is the "things" themselves eternally with Him and in Him and *His*. So, when we see ourselves in Christ, we see not only ourselves but God in Him. There is no such thing as ourselves in God apart from God in ourselves. If Jesus is one, He is the other: Humanity as seen in God *is* God seen in humanity.

We cannot help continually asking ourselves, *Is* Jesus Christ God or is He Man? The following may not help logic or psychology or dogmatics, but it may help *us* under the difficulties of these. There is no doubt that the same person may in some sense combine in himself different personalities. The only doubt is how far we may stretch that fact. When St. Paul not only recognizes but is awfully conscious in his one self of the co-existence of the I and the Christ, he is stretching a double personality to the limit of two persons within him. He may say, "Not I but Christ"—"I am dead and Christ lives in me". But the wish or will is father to the thought, as he abundantly confesses: they are both there. And St. John who says that "he who is born of God does not sin, cannot

sin",—in another breath has to confess that "if we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves and the truth is not in us". The two selves are so potent in even the truly regenerate that either Apostle can claim everything for the self that is Christ in him and nothing for the self that is not Christ. Let us be very careful not to stretch the analogy too far: but Christ's declared oneness with the Father unquestionably identifies Him with God, and He never hesitates in the exercise of His divine office and ministry to speak with all the direct authority of God; and yet, in the humanly personal experiences that lay behind his public functions, how deeply conscious He is that "of Himself" He can say or do nothing. We must even say of His sinlessness—His *posse non peccare*—that it was not His own, His human own. "He prayed with strong crying and tears unto Him that was able to save Him from death; and was heard for His godly fear". But to Him, as to us, there was no death but sin: from what other death was he saved? Sin and death are substantially synonymous. There was a human "self" in Jesus which He was all the time disclaiming—which He disclaimed to the limit of death—the death that is life: and the life which is not only that of God, but that of humanity also, a veritable "resurrection of the flesh". And all the time there was a divine self which He as little fails or hesitates to affirm to its very limit—a divine self that belongs to Him even in His humanity: "There is given me power and authority over all flesh"—"All power is given me in heaven and earth". God's love for us is His Love, God's grace in us is His Grace, God's fellowship and oneness with us is, not only His, it is He Himself in us.

In Christ then, the One Person human and divine, we see the twofold personality: in His assured oneness with the Father we see Him as God incarnating Himself in our veritable and very humanity;—on the other hand, in His temptation, His agonies of prayer and supplication, His forsakings and "conflicts with despair", we see our human-

ity, in all its natural and acquired impotence and need, in His person receiving, enacting, completing its redemption and salvation in God. Christ is human redemption as well as divine Redeemer—Man saved as well as God saving. But between the double personality so recognizable in Christ and that of St. Paul or St. John there is this immeasurable difference. In the ever incomplete oneness of the two Pauls—the "he" (or "I") and the Christ whom he is striving to make himself—there is ever visible and evident the individual human subject being saved; in the ever victorious and complete oneness of Christ with the Father that which is always manifest is the universal and divine Subject saving. Paul is each or any man seen as being saved; Christ is all men or every man viewed as saved. Paul may represent the individual or particular element or part in human salvation; Christ is the universal or absolute. If a man says—as any and every man *may* say, if he will believe—"I *am* saved, eternally, infinitely, perfectly",—that is Christ in Him. If he is battling for salvation in Christ and feeling himself still infinitely far off from it, that is the still only "he"—Paul or John or whosoever—in Christ. The one is the perfectly in Christ, in faith; the other is the very imperfectly in Christ in fact, in personal and actual attainment. But both personalities must be in the evolving Christian on earth, as both God and man are in the consummated Christ in heaven.

I can see plainly enough the shortcomings and failures—if not positive errors—in such attempted analogies as the above. But even if it explain nothing, and yet helps us to conceive and realize the inexplicable facts and realities of God and Man as One in Christ, and Christ and We as One in our true and very selves—it will be something gained. And as mere suggestion, it may move us to further and better attempts to understand and assimilate those essential truths and facts of Christianity.

One more thought: I have alluded to the apparent greater willingness to accept and receive God in inspiration

than in revelation. Men who will recognize Christ as Spirit will not believe Him as Word. Is it that the heart of man is more accessible and approachable than his head —his feelings and affections more easily touched and moved than his mind or reason convinced? Or is it that a surreptitious and unreal conception of God can more easily express and impose itself under the guise of spirit than of word? Men will call the Holy Ghost God who will not call Christ God,—and why? Is it because the Spirit is more subjective, and the Word necessarily more objective, in their respective manifestations? It is easy, and sometimes proper, to say "it" and "its" instead of "He" and "His", in speaking of the Spirit. But in doing so may we not too often be evading the question of a really divine personality of the Spirit? We may even confess the "divinity" of the Spirit in Christ and in us, and be meaning only a *quasi* divinity: a divinity, if not of ourselves and not God, yet of God only as immanent in ourselves. The Spirit is subjective and in us—the word is objective and *to* us: the Spirit may be *only* in us after all, only *our* spirit—which we have no objection to calling God's or divine; the Word, as used in Christianity, must be from without, from the objective God. The question is: How much the Spirit called divine in Christ really means the Spirit of the objective and real God. If it is really super-natural, super-sensible, super-human—if it really comes from the Eternal Spirit without and above us and communicates with the finite spirits within us which we call ourselves, in any sort of actual divine motion or influence—then why insist upon the divine communication being only subjective and in no sense or degree objective also? If God speaks to us within, why may He not do so without? Why is not a revelation to our reason as possible as an inspiration in our wills and affections?

Christianity comes to us in strict and perfect accordance with our own nature and receptive organs or faculties. We are compounded of reason and feeling, or judgment

and sentiment; from the joint action of these two proceed will, action and all the rest of our complex personality. We must know in order to any rational feeling or wishing, —but equally we must feel in order to any will or action. If Christianity is the perfection of Right Reason and of Free Will—or of Truth and Love; then equally we need Truth as the proper object of love, and love as the proper motive or impulse to Truth. God need not stir or move our affections if He does not provide their proper object —their adequate end and true function. And where that end or object is an eternal and infinite one—one wholly beyond our possible natural or human reach or experience —there must of necessity be something of the nature of revelation, of call and promise and indication from beyond. Thus religion rests within us upon a natural instinct to feel and impulse or intuition to know,—but since these call us to, prophesy and promise to us, things that the natural eye cannot see or ear hear, nor the natural heart of man conceive for himself,—therefore we need not only inspiration from within, but revelation from without "that we might know the things that are freely given to us by God".

And so we say—the Scriptures and the Church say—that Christ—the true Christ, the super-human and super-natural Christ, the eternal and divine Christ—entered into this world not by natural generation, He was "born not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God". It was the function and operation of the Holy Ghost, not *aptare Deum homini*, but *aptare hominem Deo* in His incarnate person. The "very manhood" assumed, of the substance (the exact nature) of His human Mother, was made *indeed very man*—in the truer and higher sense of Son of Man as Son of God. The Holy Ghost operating in, with and through the spiritual and divine instincts and intuitions of humanity itself, as it comes from and is by nature the child of God, is met by and united with the divine Word and invested with the

now revealed and imparted right and title to its inheritance of conscious and free sonship. So inspiration is met and completed only in revelation, the Spirit is fulfilled and satisfied only in the Word. In yet other words, freedom can be given to will and action and personality only in the gift to Reason of Light and Truth.

What, then, is the divine Christ, and what the human Christ? The divine Christ is humanity (and creation) eternally in the mind, will, and purpose of God,—humanity of the divinely right reason and free will, whose expression and utterance is The Word and The Son. The human Christ is humanity brought to self-realization and completion through revelation and incarnation in it of the Word and operation in it and through it of the Spirit. It is creation become Son of God in man through Jesus Christ.

The Justice of God in History

By W. R. Inge, D.D.,
Dean of St. Paul's.

"Shall not the judge of all the earth do right?" Abraham's question might serve as the motto of the whole of the Old Testament. Certainly if there be a God, He must be a righteous God; for an unrighteous God would not be God. If He were indifferent, we should call Him natural law; if malignant, we should call Him the Devil. Further, if there be a God, He must govern the world, for that too is contained in the idea of God. A God who did not govern the world would be no concern of ours. And yet we do not find that the world is governed in accordance with our ideas of justice. Hence the problem of theodicy, which has troubled men's minds ever since they began to think.

A great many solutions have been proposed. The Epicureans thought that the gods did not care—they live their own life and take no interest in our affairs. But who could worship a Being

> Who sees with equal eye, as Lord of all,
> A hero perish, or a sparrow fall,
> Atoms or systems into ruin hurled,
> And now a bubble burst, and now a world?

Asiatic thought has often taken refuge in dualism—the theory of a just and righteous God struggling not very successfully against a hostile malignant power. But a limited, struggling God would not be God, but only a Spirit among other spirits. If the good and the evil Spirit are wrestling in the arena, who is the umpire? The umpire must be some over-God; and we have then

to consider how he can be just. No solution which denies God's omnipotence can be satisfactory to the religious mind. Others have said, The battle is still raging, but the issue is certain and predetermined. This, we hope, is true; but it raises other questions. If injustice continues to the end of the battle, and is only put down at the last, have all those who lived and died during the conflict received the justice which they had a right to expect from omnipotence? And what will be the state of things when the battle is over? Will justice triumph in this world, or must we call into existence a new world to redress the balance of the old? Must we transfer justice to some far distant sphere, some ideal world of the imagination? Must we admit that injustice is the rule here on earth—that Dives lives and dies happy, laden with undeserved blessings, while Lazarus is as miserable as he appears to be; and then believe that as in the parable (for it is a parable and not a description of the next world, of which Christ as man willed to know nothing) compensation in kind is paid and exacted, Dives being tormented and Lazarus comforted, not so much by way of moral retribution as to make their accounts square in the matter of pleasures and pains? Another favourite solution, more popular in antiquity than in modern times, is that the individual is not the unit to whom justice is done. The unit may be the family or the nation. A great criminal may bring a curse upon his descendants; an impious king may involve his country in ruin.

Others have thought to justify the ways of God to man by attacking the notion of evil itself. Does evil touch the good man at all? Can we not see, in what appears to be evil, the necessary means by which the world-order is evolved? Cannot we consent to the decrees of nature, or of God, whatever they are, and make them our own? So argued the Stoics. "I do nothing under compulsion (says Seneca); I do not obey God

slavishly, I freely consent with Him, knowing that all things happen by fixed laws." "Those whom God loves, He hardens and braces and disciplines; He loves the good with a manly love, and says to them, let them be disciplined by labour, pain, and loss, that they may acquire true strength." "A spectacle worthy of God is a brave man struggling with adversity." We have here two topics of consolation, blended. Pain and loss are not evils, but wholesome discipline. And he who can rationally and devoutly assent to the universal law can find nothing in the course of nature to regret. But Stoicism, noble as it is, is in constant danger of becoming cant. There is no other philosophy in which the peril of unreality is so great. One of the best stories about Jowett, the famous Master of Balliol, relates how a pupil asked him, *à propos* of one of the Stoic paradoxes, "Master, do you really think that a good man could be happy on the rack?" The Master, after a little reflection, answered with his most cherubic expression, "Well, perhaps a very good man—on a *very* bad rack!" It is no use pretending that we can always say *Non dolet.*

Emerson goes even further than the Stoics. He argues that justice is done universally, here and now, if we could only see it. It is only on a low estimate of what makes happiness that the bad are happy and the good miserable. From a higher point of view justice is not postponed. Crime and punishment grow out of one stem. Punishment is a fruit which ripens unsuspected within the fruit of the pleasure which concealed it. You cannot do wrong without suffering wrong. The thief steals from himself; the swindler swindles himself. Nothing can work me damage except myself. I am never a real sufferer but by my own fault. These are beautiful thoughts. But the successful literary man of the nineteenth century, living in perfect security and considerable comfort, knew little of the darker mysteries of human suffering. Could Emerson have borne to

turn his graceful epigrams if he had lived in Belgium in 1914, or in Armenia in 1915? The emperor Maurice, we are told, when his children were murdered before his eyes, repeated "Righteous art thou, O God, and true is thy judgment"; and we admire the dignity and fortitude with which he met his fate. But can any of us understand why a just and good God permits such things to be done?

The resignation of the Byzantine emperor seems to us, after all, rather inhuman. We can sympathise more readily with a modern English poet who, after a more normal bereavement, writes as follows:—

> She knelt upon her brother's grave,
> My little girl of six years old—
> He used to be so good and brave,
> The sweetest lamb of all our fold;
> He used to shout, he used to sing,
> Of all our tribe the little king—
> And so unto the turf her ear she laid,
> To hark if still in that dark place he played.
> No sound! no sound!
> Death's silence was profound;
> And horror crept
> Into her aching heart, and Dora wept.
> If this is as it ought to be,
> My God, I leave it unto Thee. (T. E. Brown.)

Must we, after all, fall back on blind faith, and say with Plato, "For the just man all things will at last work together for good, both in life and in death"? How then shall we answer the indignant rejoinder, "Your optimism is without warrant. God, like everyone else, must be judged by His actions. I agree with John Stuart Mill, who exclaimed, I will call no being good who is not what I mean by good when I apply the word to my fellow-creatures"? Mere resignation is a possible frame of mind, but it does not satisfy the Christian, who has been taught to look for justice and mercy from God, and will not be put off with mere words when he cannot find it.

The Old Testament is still the best introduction to

the whole problem. It has the great advantage of being the record of a long experience, both happy and bitter, not merely of speculation. We can trace how the old crude ideas are purified in the furnace of affliction, till the time for a new revelation is fully ripe. The justice of God may be said to be the main subject of the Old Testament from beginning to end. No nation was ever more convinced that the good things of this world are intended for the righteous, and that "misfortune shall slay the ungodly"; but this conviction had at last to give way before the repeated blows of adverse circumstances, till a nobler and truer faith dawned upon the minds of the prophets.

The problem first became acute in face of the menace from Assyria. Isaiah reiterates the older belief. "Come now, and let us reason together, saith Jehovah; if your sins be as scarlet, shall they be as white as snow? If they be red like crimson, shall they be as wool? If ye be willing and obedient, ye shall eat the good of the land. But if ye refuse and rebel, ye shall be devoured with the sword; for the mouth of Jehovah hath spoken it." Amos, while denouncing the outrages of Israel's enemies upon our common humanity, bids his countrymen to trace the cause of their afflictions to its source in their own pride and luxury, and above all to their tolerance of social injustice. But his prophecy contains one verse of far deeper insight. "You only have I known of all the families of the earth; therefore I will visit upon you all your iniquities." Soon, however, the stricken people breaks into open revolt: "The way of the Lord is not equal." The voices had become more strident in the days of Malachi. "Every one that doeth evil is good in the sight of Jehovah, and he delighteth in them." Ezekiel, who has been called the Calvin of the Old Testament, seems insensible to the mystery of pain. Jehovah is a jealous God; He vindicates His own glory. Man is too vile a creature to plead with Him. There is

no such thing as vicarious punishment; the soul that sinneth, it shall die. With all its harshness, this doctrine of individual responsibility marks an epoch in the long debate; once stated, it could never be forgotten. And the pitiless denial of human merit also emphasises one side of the truth. "Not for your sake do I this, saith the Lord Jehovah, be it known unto you: be ashamed and confounded for your ways, O house of Israel." Soon after Ezekiel comes the second Isaiah, with his picture of the suffering "Servant of Jehovah," an idealised portrait of the Israelitish nation. These chapters contain a strange blend of universalism and particularism; noble visions of Israel as the light of the Gentiles, the bringer of salvation to the ends of the earth, are mingled with dreams of gross material prosperity and domination, reserved by Jehovah for the people of his choice. The profoundest thought in them is that the exile and ruin of the nation was a martyrdom; its sufferings were for the healing of other nations; its chastisement was to win their peace. So, with gradually growing insight, the nation passed through alternations of hope and dejection, till we reach the period of the apocalypses, when the complete loss of political independence led to the expectation of deliverance by sudden miraculous intervention, and not by natural means. These apocalypses are visions of the spiritual which have materialised as dreams of the supernatural. Their source is a genuine faith, which is not strong enough to remain true to itself. Or we may say that Greek idealism, with which the Jews were now in contact, is struggling in them with Jewish historicism. The hoped-for heaven is not yet in a spaceless and timeless world, but in the future, and at Jerusalem. Yet it was in this period that the "blessed hope of everlasting life" first begins to shed bright, though intermittent, beams upon the dark night of national tribulation. In Daniel the doctrine of the resurrection finds clear expression. "Many that sleep in the dust

of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt. And they that be wise shall shine as the brightness of the firmament, and they that turn many to righteousness as the stars for ever and ever."

We have omitted the splendid but baffling poem called Job, which perhaps dates from the end of the fifth century. So far as any answer can be found in this book to the great question "Is God just?", it is that he who has seen God, not merely by the hearing of the ear but by intimate experience, can rise above the problem. Job's sin was self-absorption; he wished to keep a *meum* and *tuum* account with his Maker. Jehovah shows him that this is too cramped a view. God's interests are not purely human and individual. The wonders of nature point to a far wider scheme, of which man is a part, but which man cannot understand. Faith and humility do not answer the great question, but they may prevent us from wishing to ask it. The same lesson is taught in some of the Psalms.

Only one book remains. The cynical pessimism of Ecclesiastes, so strangely but wisely included in the Canon, marks the inevitable reaction against dreams of future deliverance which were not good enough to be true. The Preacher finds vanity and emptiness everywhere. Man delights him not, and woman still less. There is no justice in the world; there is one event to the righteous and to the wicked. The wisest thing is to take the goods the gods provide us, and observe moderation, even in virtue. "Be not righteous overmuch, neither be thou overwise; why shouldest thou destroy thyself?" After such a disillusionment as this, so complete a bankruptcy of the old hopes, the time was certainly ripe for the new revelation.

Christianity is a form of radical optimism, based on a quite peculiar standard of values, which it affirms to correspond with objective truth.

This statement is justified by the recorded teaching of our Lord, by the impression which His character made upon those who associated with Him, and by the development of Christian principles in the hands of those who have understood them best. Christ proclaimed an optimism, and the most complete optimism ever maintained by a great teacher. The world was created by an all-powerful, all-wise, and all-loving Being, whose watchful care extends even to the humblest of His creatures, so that a sparrow cannot fall to the ground without His knowledge and consent. He clothes the grass of the field with greenness; He decks the lilies more beauteously than Solomon in all his glory; it is He who causes the sun to shine and the rain to fall. To mankind especially He is a Father. He knows what things we have need of before we ask Him; if He desires our petitions it is only as a proof of our love and trust. The troubles and sorrows of life are sent us for our good. They are powerless to harm us. For our true life is eternal; death is an insignificant episode, even when accompanied with "the worst that man can breathe". "Some of you they shall kill and crucify; and there shall not an hair of your head perish." The object of the Creation is said by Christianity to be the manifestation of God's glory. This phrase is often misunderstood, and is sometimes ridiculed by vulgar assailants of religion, as if the Deity were actuated, on this theory, by a petty desire to hear His own praises sung. The manifestation of God's glory means simply the externalisation of His attributes under the form of purposes to be realised in space and time. As regards the human race, the chief of those purposes is the moral progress of mankind, to be achieved by overcoming difficulty and temptation. "This is the will of God, even your sanctification."

An optimistic view of life is a hollow sham unless it is based on a belief in human immortality, and on a drastic revaluation of human goods and ills. The Gospel of

Christ gives us both, and in close relation to each other. The real goods of this life are those which participate most in the timeless goods of the spiritual world. Pain and privations are made light of; they leave no sting behind them. Worldly prosperity is rather a snare than a blessing, because it entangles us in the cumbrous apparatus of life, wastes our time and impairs our spiritual independence. The best and purest of all joys is natural affection, and the acts of kindness in which it finds expression are the most acceptable service that we can render to God. The crown of all the virtues—that virtue in which all others are briefly comprehended—is no longer justice, as with the Greeks, but love or sympathy. Love is to be the main motive of our actions, and the atmosphere of our inner life. The affections bring us nearer to God than either the intellect or the conscience.

The enemies of the spiritual life are half personified by Christian theology as the World, the Flesh, and the Devil. The world is the name of human society as it organises itself apart from God. It is the social organism, in so far as it is unaffected by religion. It is a loosely federated society, resting largely on co-operative injustice with limited liability, professing aims which are not only selfish but barbarous (for the civilisation of the majority is only skin-deep, and if you scratch the man or woman of fashion you soon come to the barbarian), and it demands a very arduous and irksome service from those who would win its prizes. The Christian is to keep outside this network of unworthy aim and practice, so far as is possible. Next, he is warned against the Flesh, that is, the bodily appetites. Our Lord seldom cared to denounce the sins of the flesh, that is to say, offences against temperance, soberness, or chastity, and He did not regard the sensualist as incurable. In fact, He much preferred these sinners to religious bigots. But His whole standard of values ranks sensual gratifica-

tion very cheap indeed; and He quietly tells us that if any organ of the body becomes rebellious, and so impedes us in our sipritual journey, we should be ready to pluck it out or cut it off. His teaching is in fact too lofty to concern itself in detail with the temptations of sense. They had been driven out, in the case of His disciples, by a higher motive, a more compelling enthusiasm: and this is, in truth, always the best way to drive them out. It is less easy to classify the third class of temptations, those which are referred to the direct agency of the powers of evil. It is idle to discuss whether the "personality" of the devil is asserted in the New Testament. It is enough to say that the Greek language had no word for personality, and wanted none. The temptations of the devil seem to be those which are not part of our present characters, though if we yield to them they may become so. They come to us from without in the same sense in which the suggestions of the Holy Spirit come to us from without. (The spatial metaphor is so obviously a metaphor that it should not mislead anyone.) The temptations of the devil are of a darker hue than those of the world and the flesh, because they involve a *deliberate* repudiation of the religious standard of value. A man who could say "Evil, be thou my good," and act upon that maxim, would be "a child of the devil." The man who "doth not abhor anything that is evil"; who "not only does such things, but has pleasure in them that do them", is obviously nearer the bottom of the moral scale than the sensualist who alternately sins and repents: and if any man, after knowing and understanding the Person and teaching of Christ, could say of Him, "He hath an unclean spirit", it is difficult to see by what avenue the grace of repentance could ever find entrance into his soul. The condition of the unregenerate man is, we gather from the New Testament, characterised most generally by selfishness, hardness, and worldliness, while the chief fruits of the Spirit are love, joy and peace.

Let us now consider what (if any) view of the world may be said to follow necessarily from this teaching. Can it be made the basis of a philosophical system?

In the first place it is plain that the Christian world-view is essentially teleological. God had a purpose in creating the universe; He has a purpose for the human race, and He has a purpose for each individual man and woman. Now an infinite purpose is a contradiction in terms. For a purpose is something which has a beginning, middle and end. A purpose that had no beginning could never be formed, and a purpose that had no end would be eternally frustrate. We are therefore driven to conceive of the world as a system of finite purposes, realisable in time, which, although they interlace and overlap, are best viewed as unitary wholes, each expressing some definite idea in the mind of God, some definite act of His will. Whether the number of such purposes is finite or infinite we cannot tell; the question has perhaps only a speculative or theoretical interest; but one practical conclusion of great importance does seem to follow. If the world-order which we know is an unitary whole in the mind of God, if a single purpose runs through human history, and the longer history of stars and planets, then this world-order must be finite, it must have had a beginning and it must have an end. There may, of course, be a vast number of world-orders, existing either simultaneously or consecutively, but if the universe is "eternal" (in the vulgar sense of persisting through an infinite series of points of time), then it must be the passive instrument of an infinite series of independent purposes, and from our point of view its unity is broken up. When we think of the world-order we think of a single coherent system, and my point is that the teleology of Christianity requires us to regard such a system as finite. Further, any philosophy which involves God in the world-process, which we know, making our world-order as necessary to God as God is

to the world-order, is incompatible with Christianity. There can be no purpose in a process which persists through infinite time, and a God who is merely immanent in a finite scheme is not divine. Further, the recognition of the finitude and ultimate doom of the world-order, regarded as a temporal sequence, carries with it the belief in an eternal order. A purpose, in working for its own fulfilment, is not trying to commit suicide. Its aim is to win its way into the sphere of timeless reality. A teleological view of the world necessarily implies a belief in a spiritual world, exalted above time and place, in which every fulfilled purpose, every realised *meaning*, which has been actualised in the world of becoming, takes its final place and rank. It is because we have reason to believe that human individuals are in God's sight unitary wholes, created with some unique task to fulfil, that we believe confidently in our own immortality. The only beings which are not immortal are those (if such there be) which have no meaning or value apart from the place which they occupy in the time-series; and it is easy to prove that the human soul has many timeless relations. Human personality is constituted by its uniqueness and unity of timeless meaning; there is, in Platonic language, a type laid up in heaven, an "idea", of each individual.

The basis of the Christian *the cry of knowledge* is the doctrine that man was made in the image of God, and is therefore, potentially or ideally, *capax deitatis*. We are in a "fallen" state; that is, we were meant to rise above our present position and at each stage of our ascent we are surrounded by a world more and more like the truth and reality of things. Knowledge of self and of the external world progress *pari passu* with knowledge of God, and knowledge of God is determined mainly, though not entirely, by ethical progress. Ethical progress, in its turn, depends not so much on external conduct which can be measured by results, as on the right direction of

the will and warmth of the affections. Christian "knowledge" is therefore no abstract intellectualism, but the result of experience which has gone to form character. This is the meaning of the "inwardness" on which Matthew Arnold and others have rightly insisted as characteristic of Christianity. That which comes to us from outside can neither purify nor defile: it can neither illumine nor obscure the mental vision. All experience must enter into our characters, before it can become *our* knowledge. And from the heart of man proceeds that interpretation of experience which can make it either a blessing or a curse to us. External things have no moral quality in themselves, they are irradiated or befouled by the soul that comes into contact with them.

If it be asked, why has this blessedness, which in the highest sense is natural to man, his birthright and his inheritance, to be striven for with labour and tears and many painful stumblings, Christianity has a plain answer. The redeemed are in happier case than the elect. It is better that salvation should be "worked out" than that it should be given at once. In fact, we are so constituted that it *could* not be given at once; for it cannot be ours while our characters remain untransformed by it. The very idea of purpose implies a process, and the achievement of an ethical purpose implies an ethical process, and therefore a moral struggle. Perhaps we think that we should have made the world differently; but that is because we become weary of the struggle with evil, and would fain be delivered from it. When our warfare is accomplished, we shall judge otherwise. To give a very trivial illustration—when we are toiling up a mountain side we sometimes wish that we could fly to the top; but that does not represent our reasoned judgment. We go to the Alps to climb them, not to escape having to climb them. The prize is *in* the effort.

This is the chief contribution which Christianity makes towards the solution of the problem of evil, which

it does not profess to solve completely. There could be no world without evil. "It must needs be that offences come." And yet, "Woe unto him by whom they come." There remains here a difficulty, which is the more troublesome because it is a moral as well as an intellectual puzzle. It is difficult to suppose that the existence of lost souls can be a necessary part of the moral scheme of a morally perfect Creator, or that He can have willed not merely the possibility but the actuality of a partial frustration of His own designs. And yet it is quite certain that Christianity will have nothing to say to metaphysical dualism. The devil is God's enemy, not His rival. It is equally certain that we are forbidden to suppose that evil is confined to things, not persons. On this hypothesis every vital idea in the mind of God might be realised after a struggle with difficulties purposely placed in the way. Life in this case would be an obstacle race in which all the competitors reach the goal sooner or later in a state of healthy fatigue. Christianity will not allow us to cherish these comfortable fancies. The struggle is a far more tragic affair than our popular good-natured universalism will account for. Whether we like it or not, Christianity knows of a hell as well as of a heaven.

But though "the problem of evil" remains a problem even for Christians, many of the popular objections to the presence of evil in the world are answered by reference to the Christian standard of values, which is very different, as we have seen, from that which passes current among us. Among the peculiarities of the Christian standard of values, besides its inwardness, its spirituality and its idealism, is the doctrine of gain through pain, of victory through defeat, which was revealed fully in the Incarnation and Passion of our Redeemer. This is an universal law of the spiritual life; it indicates a path to be trodden by all. "He that will save his soul (ψυχήν) shall lose it; and he that is willing to lose his soul for

my sake, shall find it". The sting of pain is drawn when it is turned into sacrifice. Whatever we surrender, without *arrière pensée*, to God, is given back to us in another form, a form under which we *could* not receive it, if the surrender had not been made quite without reserve. This is a mysterious but undoubted law of spiritual life. God's ledger confounds all earthly computations of profit and loss.

Christianity is not world-renouncing in the ordinary sense, since it teaches that God made the world and made it very good. The half-Christian Gnostics, whose contempt for the beautiful world so angered the Greek soul in Plotinus, were attempting to mix genuine Orientalism with Christianity, and the unhappy attempt was most happily frustrated. Neither the Judaic nor the Hellenic tradition in Christianity could tolerate this kind of dualism. Christian asceticism is what St. Paul tells us that it is, a system of training, as men train for a race. It is not a mutilation of the personality: God has given us no useless organs to be removed by surgery. Every creature of God is good, and not to be refused without reason. And the most favourable condition for spiritual growth is not extreme privation but simple and healthy living. Some Christian saints have learned that it is unwise to be too hard upon "our brother the ass": that is our bodies. The strange outbreak of violent self-buffeting in the early centuries of Church history has never, I think, been adequately explained. It was a symptom of racial disease, which was possibly a consequence of other diseases, a desperate attempt to throw off poisons which were threatening the life of the species. In any case, it neither began within the Christian Church, nor was in any essential connection with Christian doctrines and principles. There were pagan pillar-saints before St. Simeon Stylites. It was connected with disorders in the life of the sexes, and with the world-weariness which overtook the Empire in the third century of

our era. The horror of marriage which we find in the writers of this period is an unnatural perversion which followed upon other unnatural perversions. Race-suicide, of which we now talk in an absurd manner (for in England the births still outnumber the deaths by nearly two to one) was at that time a real menace. But for the healthier condition of the semitic stocks, which kept up their numbers in the Eastern provinces, and the steady immigration of Germans into Southern Europe, the Empire would have been almost depopulated.

But though Christianity is not a world-renouncing creed, it is essentially an other-worldly creed. The meaning of this will be understood from what has been said a few pages back. The reality and meaning of temporal life are found by Christianity in the development of character under the discipline afforded by earthly conditions. Merely temporal and external results are valued very lightly unless they can be shown to contribute to this end. It is thus true that Christianity views with no enthusiasm, perhaps even with misgiving, that kind of "progress" which seems only to complicate life by multiplying its apparatus. It may well be that our religion, if really accepted by the nation at large, would rather retard than accelerate the advance of material civilisation. Its advice has always been to simplify life as much as possible, and to balance our accounts with our surroundings rather by reducing our denominator than by increasing our numerator.

The attitude of the Gospel towards secular governments is one of benevolent neutrality. There are some institutions, such as slavery, which were bound to be, sooner or later, abolished as incompatible with the Christian principle of the essential equality of mankind in the sight of God; but even here the policy of the early Church was to accept existing arrangements and make them work as well as possible—the opposite policy to that of all social revolutionaries. St. Paul bids the slave

attach no importance to his position, and even not to accept opportunities of changing it. (This is certainly the meaning of I Cor. vii, 21.) Christianity facilitates social reform mainly by creating a sound public opinion, and weakening the opposition of vested interests. But it is itself a living witness to the truth that the highest life may be led under the most unfavourable conditions of environment. The progress which Christianity regards as alone really valuable is progress in individual character; though unquestionably it also encourages us to regard the race as an unit, which has its own life to live, its own ideals to realise. The conception of progress was never so clearly enunciated in pre-Christian society as in the Gospel of St. John. It is there distinctly stated that revelation under Christianity is to be progressive, and that the goal is to be a Christophany in redeemed humanity itself.

We have travelled far from the crude primitive doctrine that God distributes pleasure and pain, prosperity and adversity, in strict correspondence with moral desert and demerit. But we are now on the bedrock of fact. Man can rise above his fate, not by ignoring evil or running away from it, not by cherishing any comforting delusions about it, but with open eyes and resolute will, by accepting the imitation of Christ as his highest good. We are not to envy the triumphs of successful wickedness, nor to make the sufferings of the good an insoluble problem. Do we really think that God has blessed the successful spoiler of the poor, the tyrant or the trickster, because his eyes swell with fatness, and he does even what he lusts? Do we wish for such rewards ourselves? And can we venture to pity the saints and martyrs and heroes who have been treated as mankind usually treats its greatest benefactors? Would we not gladly so live and so die ourselves? God is not unjust; but He neither rewards nor fines us in the currency of this world.

These reflections have their bearing on the tragic dis-

aster which has overtaken Europe. For the Christian, nothing absolutely vital is at stake in any secular conflict. But assuredly the Christian may love his country, as dearly as His Master loved the Holy City when He wept over it. And we may remember for our comfort that a great war is not a constitutional disease; it is more like a dangerous accident, causing severe shock and great loss of blood. If the patient is healthy, there will be, after a period of prostration and weakness, a complete and rapid recovery. Nations do not die of war, unless they are exterminated like the unhappy Armenians. It is social and moral disorders that kill nations. "Those wounds heal ill that men do give themselves." It is here, much more than in the history of international relations, that the old Jewish theodicy has its partial justification.

The Organic Unity Of Christ's Church

By S. Parkes Cadman, D.D.,
Central Congregational Church, Brooklyn.

The indisturbable belief that the unity of the Church is a primal necessity for her present action and the divinely appointed goal of Christian experience and Christian history has had to encounter apparently insuperable obstacles. Those who hold it, an increasing host of meditative and prayerful souls, have good reason to know it is of faith and not of sight, and its persistence in them despite every untoward circumstance cannot be explained from the human side. The imagination of the respective Churches has been unduly impressed with the importance of their divisions. These have been revered and eulogized as sacred ordinations, against which it were the height of disloyalty, not to say impiety, to rebel. The things which are peculiar, distinctive, separatist, have had a great moment of undiscriminating praise, the traditions of which will linger long and be keenly felt in the healthy reaction which has now begun.

It would be superfluous to deal at length with the development of manifold and diversified ecclesiastical types, ritualistic forms and theological dogmas. Their direct and indirect causes, the motives that governed their progenitors, the relative importance of these, their connections with one another, their particular merits and efforts, their political, social, philosophical and religious environments, the sum total of these various factors, and aught else which legitimately enters into a comprehensive

survey of such dimensions, exhaust the learning of the Church and test her reliance upon a superintending Power. For nowhere else does the blended life of thought and deed become so subtle and intricate as in the realm of religious speculation. It spreads its roots over widely separated areas; it draws its sustenance from sources which betray little or no kinship among themselves. However far-flung and accurate the lines of investigation may be, they are extremely liable to omit or misconstrue the secret records of human souls out of which have arisen historic sects and creeds and confusions. Yet few studies, while more exacting, are more compensatory, more chastening to predeliction and prejudice, more stimulative of sanity and magnanimity. Problems which have been surrendered, except by the incurably optimistic, as entirely beyond solution, yield sweetness and meat to the thinker who once again wrestles with them. Later efforts to reconcile the apparently irreconcilable contentions of what should be the Body of the Lord at least keep alive the main ideas and aims involved. Even at the lowest point of efficiency they discipline the minds exercised in their behalf and show that it is infinitely more salutary to agitate for the Christianizing of Christianity after the pattern of its Founder than to resume our egregious complacency with denominational boundaries.

Perhaps no inclusive philosophical and theological system which embraced objective and subjective phenomena alike has been so severely reprimanded by modern intellectualism as that of medieval Scholasticism. Its advocates and expounders were accused of fabricating absurd and useless propositions in the discussion of which they themselves became hopelessly entangled. These undeserved aspersions have lost caste; they are displaced by the weightier judgment that St. Thomas, Duns Scotus, William of Ockham and their disciples gave practical proof of eagerness in thinking and exhibited an energy in

subjecting all that was real to thought, that has no parallel in any other period. If they did not enrich and widen the experiences of scholarship, they trained and balanced the faculties for its acquirement, and thus prepared them for penetrative and successful work. Their derided metaphysic made trial of its age, and allied itself with that of later inductive methods. It was their specific mission to strengthen and prepare the understanding, to make it alert, flexible, tractable; and ready to enter upon the vast areas of the natural sciences which presently were opened to its research. Should the leaders and guides of Christian thought display an equal rectitude and zeal today, tomorrow's horizon would lift illimitably and the continuity and progress of the Kingdom of God would be reestablished and accelerated.

Again, it is always possible that further consideration of such a cardinal truth as Christian Unity may divine the secrets of an age unborn and lay bare to our gaze those essentials which must mold and fulfil the moral and spiritual institutions of posterity. Phases of reality, which hitherto have escaped attention or have not received sufficient emphasis, emerge at every turn. The ameliorating drifts of Time favour this argument. What was impossible in the fourteenth was inevitable in the sixteenth century. The present status of our plea for organic unity is a further proof of this noiseless readjustment of vexed affairs. It has directed suggestions once ridiculed towards fruitful issues. Ideas which seemed far-fetched and chimerical have been justified. A closer scrutiny of the stone which our fathers rejected bids fair to make it the head stone of the corner. Reverent acknowledgment of the Real Presence in the Church furnishes her with renewed hope. Events which in themselves were tragical afford devout hearts the consolation that

> "Power is with us in the night
> Which makes the darkness and the light,
> And dwells not in the light alone."

He would be an unscientific hydrographer who described the oceans in nothing more than their surface calms, storms, tempests. Beneath these lie unfathomable and silent depths, reservoirs of replenishment and revival, in which are contained the remnants of past aeons, and the elements of sanitation and vitality that help to preserve the habitable globe. In like manner, notwithstanding her distresses, her earthly handling of the heavenly treasure committed to her keeping, her disobedience and failure, the Church has never lost her regenerative function. This has enabled her to deal with the soul and conscience of the race, to preserve her witness to the fundamental laws of grace and truth, and to proclaim the Evangel upon which Christian culture and character depend. The mere impressionist can find abundant evidence to the contrary, but he should qualify this by remembering that faith and love have had the final word. The Image of the Risen Christ is indelibly engraven on the mind of Christendom, nor can it be erased. He reveals the Father Who devises means whereby His banished children be not driven from Him. The Holy Spirit administers the dispensation we occupy: He broods over the ruin and desolation wrought by feuds and schisms; He regulates their claims and counter claims, admits or rejects their contentions, subjects their temporalities to His eternal will, and binds together their isolated epochs. We cannot too freely condemn the past without condemning Him. And to His animation we can safely refer the regal conviction that whatever else may be postponed, the interests of organized Christianity are paramount at this hour. The intense persuasion that all who profess and call themselves Christians are chiefly concerned with those interests is His self-expression in us. To be with Christ, and against whatever antagonizes His present and future purposes; to repudiate the dearest local loyalties in behalf of a richer, fuller communion and communicating ability to-

ward the multitudes beyond the pale; what is this but the mind of the Paraclete? The grand passion for a Church truly holy, truly catholic; a Church which can, if needs be, override its past, and rise superior to hereditary traits and distinctions; a Church thus considered, as the present Body and prospective Bride of her Redeemer and Lord; is the passion which should inflame and enlarge our hearts, that we may run in the way of His commandments.

The principal benefit of humanity is not in the democracy we loudly boast, still less is it in the autocracy we wisely deplore. Revelation and reason have found it in a compacted brotherhood of confessing saints, governed by the precepts of the New Testament, nurtured by the Life which is beyond life. This was the genius of Apostolic Christianity, when, as a spontaneous movement from above, it began to circulate in the expiring morality of Paganism. Whatever subsequent additions have obscured that genius, they could not sever it from its divine Author. Its spirit burned on within the wheels, flamed out beyond them, consumed useless and retarding mechanisms, and is yet residual with us, responsive to our call. It is a spirit of warning as well as of victory, showing how perils can be survived and achievements won. It recalls us to our duty and bids us beware of the slow demolition, the steady sapping and mining of Christian ideals. If the Church should dwindle, become insignificant, negligible in the imperial counsels of men, a pale shadow of her former self, it will be because she lowers her exaltations for the sake of factionists, or compromises her sanctities for those who seek relief therefrom by a process of simplification, or utilizes her spiritual instincts to serve the jaded moods of secularists. These fragmentary remarks indicate the general standpoint from which the question of Church Unity should be viewed and the constructive temper that should pervade its discussion.

II

We are not to put from us what we find in the New Testament on such a matter, nor regard it as an ideal beyond the range of possibility, nor set out resolved to refute it for the sake of our segregated Israels. Though we attempt these things, and look about for the best means to do so, wrapping ourselves in the associations of a sectarian past, conceiving that to be verity which we desire to be such, and making a god of it, these processes will not avail against what is written. The words of the Lord Jesus and their legitimate development by the Apostles are the standards by which Church doctrine is to be judged. Their light radiates on our twilight zone, in which the champion of denominational necessity and benefit are not so clamorous as of yore. The majority of believers agree that their divisions are lamentable; that they constitute a wide departure from our Lord's authoritative conception of the fellowship of faith; and some insist that they are a fatal violation of the primary ideal of the Christian organism which can no longer be palliated or excused. Years ago the gravest and wisest of Anglicans, Dean Richard William Church, spoke of the poisonous contagion of disunion as arresting the holiness and the advance of the Church. His diagnosis, hotly resented at the time, has since been admitted by Christians of every kind. Erudite inquiries concerning this malignancy, however sincerely and righteously attempted, do not meet the actual needs of the situation. The tearings asunder which have ravaged catholicity and weakened the structure of the House of God are not to be regarded as congenital to Christianity, nor as an inevitable sequence of lawful liberty in profession, once these issues are balanced and understood. The bitterness and narrowness of the several parts, each more anxious for itself than for the whole, will not stand the scrutiny of those multitudes beyond their borders who are no longer charmed

by the disputations of controversial theology. The world we encounter is not dumb, listless, illiterate; still less apathetic or indifferent toward true religion. But it refuses to be commandeered by a few highly placed ecclesiastics, and demands that the battle for preference be transferred to the human arena. Non-Christian nations also have had sufficient access to the teachings of Jesus to note the gulf between our theory and our practice.

It is therefore of the utmost moment that the balancing and understanding referred to should be undertaken, and eventually accomplished in the steady resolution that the Church must be what her glorified Head intended her to be, and in no wise, under no conceivable inducement, be anything except that. He alone gave her life, being, rationale; her charter and her embassy came from Him. None have the right to modify these, or go about to establish their tribal and nationalistic cults, altars, covenants: too often, alas! intolerant and adverse toward one another. The congregation of souls reborn, gathered out of every tongue and kindred, fused into a spiritual solidarity which transcends fleshly ties, broadly and securely founded on Christ's Personality and Work, cemented in common experiences of Divine life and love, and consecrated by service and devotion, is set forth in the Gospel of St. John as proceeding directly from Jesus. In those ever memorable discourses from which we presently quote, the Master spoke of Himself as the Vine, and of believers as the branches. His interfusion made their maze one growth, every tendril and bud sprang from His root, each cluster was red with His sublime Sacrifice. He further anticipated a universal acceptance of the Gospel through this communion, which should be kept from all evil, set free and sanctified by the truth He had made known, perfected in peace and confidence, with every part indissolubly joined and supplied from His resources at the right hand of the Majesty on high. "I have manifested

Thy name unto the men which Thou gavest Me out of the world, and they have kept Thy word. . . . For I have given unto them the words which Thou gavest Me, and they have received them, and have known surely that I came out from Thee, and they have believed that Thou didst send Me" (St. John's Gospel, 17: 6–8). These divine sentiments and intentions are the main burden of our Saviour's Intercessory Prayer. They lay upon His heart in the hour of its breaking, they were breathed forth in the holy atmosphere of the Upper Chamber. He there supplicated that "they all may be one as We are one, that they all may be one, as Thou, Father, art in Me, and I in Thee, that they also may be one in Us". Higher and higher still into the eternal purposes of Deity this unique petition ascends—"I in them and Thou in Me, that they may be made perfect in one . . . and that the world may know that Thou hast sent Me" (St. John's Gospel, 17: 21–23).

The intense yearning for the unity of the faithful which throbs throughout these requests was a significant part of the travail of our Lord. That He died for the redemption of souls, we well know. Are we equally aware He also died for the incorporation of souls redeemed into the life of God? That we are to be one as the Father and the Son are one is indeed an august, an overwhelming conception, the very splendour of which evokes the fear that Christianity may not be possible to our frailty. This spiritual oneness, fulfilled in the brightness of the Divine Society, is the eclipse of miracle. Yet nothing short of its realization in absolute unity of life, will and aspiration is here unmistakably expressed. Nor can the mightiest work of grace be wrought except in those who rigidly adhere to the rule of faith; who pass out of pious contemplation into the immovable decision that in this, as in everything, love is victorious and we are the bond servants of Christ Jesus. Did the conception have power as it has authority, it would

speedily transform the Church, level her artificial barriers, and fill her anæmic veins with vital blood. Tarry though she may in doubt and in the qualms which doubt generates, she will have to arise and gird herself for this enterprise, if she would justify Christ's trust in her, and prove competent to obey His will. Once united after the manner and intimacy of His union with the Father, she becomes the capable instrument, the living agent, the co-operative partner, the delight, and the dwelling place of God.

At the beginning of His ministry, our Lord appealed to the credentials of His Personality. When these failed to win the trust and reverence of His countrymen, He asked for their faith in His mission because of the manifest blessings it bestowed. Those whose prejudice and malevolence prevented them from apprehending His Being could hardly deny the aid and comfort He rendered to the sad, the sick and the sinful. But notwithstanding these signs and wonders, the unbelief of Pharisee and Sadducee persisted. Now, in the solemn hours before He took leave of the world, He transferred the witness to Himself from Himself to the Church. Nothing preceding this act was invalidated or set aside; on the contrary, it was thereby consummated. He had come to His own, they had rejected their Prince, but to as many as received Him, to them gave He power to become the Sons of God, and in their brotherhood, to espouse His cause and transmit His message. Thus His consciousness of the Father was multiplied in many offspring, and this duplicated experience was evidenced in the new commandment:—"that ye love one another, as I have loved you. By this shall all know that ye are my disciples" (St. John's Gospel, 13: 34–35). The tacit objection which lurks in the background of numerous minds, and questions the practicability of such a divine society existent here on the earth may be lessened, if not removed, by a careful study of the particular words the Master

used. They recognised in their distinctions that time element which is essential for the verification of eternal realities. In the twenty-first and twenty-third verses of the seventeenth chapter of St. John's Gospel, Jesus speaks of BELIEF and KNOWLEDGE respectively, and of their symmetry in the sacred philosophy of Church unity. Men are *first to believe* and THEN TO KNOW the witness of the Church to Him. Their attitude of sympathetic inclination gradually merges into one of assurance: into the conviction that faith is valid, reasonable, unimpeachable. Obviously an interval is required for this mergence and cumulation. The extent of that interval must be measurably subject to the normal processes which govern human thought. Nothing in the nature of a universal immediacy can be logically inferred from His words, but rather such a constantly widening influence as was indicated in the parables of the leaven and of the mustard seed. The Church as a living organism, not as a miraculously finished, mechanical product: the Church, as the companion of every human fate, yet superior to defeat: finding herself and her joy in her pains of growth, is the institution this mature Gospel presents: an institution which is fulfilled in her fulfilment of the offices of her Lord toward the entire drama of humanity. Not until she is "made perfect in one" is the world to attain the height of confidence denoted by the phrase that it "may KNOW that Thou hast sent me". And if the living forces of providential ages, as we have said, make possible in one century that which was impossible in others, they also reject the interpretation of a pessimistic school which entirely despairs of the world and very largely of the Church. Its forebodings predict a general cataclysm wherein the race will be engulfed, and out of which a scanty remnant of the elect will be preserved to millennial bliss. The intolerance of this cult is either due to an absence of vision or a loss of faith, and in both instances is in-

dicative of spiritual fatigue rather than of spiritual energy; productive of little except strictly individualistic piety at the expense of charity and hope.

The Apostolic writings develop the germinal words of Jesus. They are not superfluous additions, but manifestations in thought, word and deed of one unbroken revelation and doctrine. Christianity began in a given form, and went forward to preserve its substance and content in the Epistles. For a too brief era the newly founded Church, so historically near to her Risen Head, dwelt in Him. In the strength of that union she created for herself an indisputable supremacy, and produced the literature of the New Testament. Whatever may have been the modifications or extensions of its teachings they were advantageous to the consistency and propagation of the Original Evangel. Apparent variations, especially in the Pauline letters, were due to the power of the truth to impress its ideas upon a premier mind of surpassing virility and breadth. These ideas, being subject matter for the exercise of the tent-maker's reason, expanded into germane reflections, harmonious with one another and with the whole reality of Christ's message. For the more fertile ideas are, the more manifold their aspects. Too opulent for quick reception, their bearings cannot always be instantaneously perceived. So it was with the great sayings of Jesus. Illuminated by the Holy Spirit, the meditative gaze of the Apostle quietly absorbed them. Their implicit truths became explicit, and out of them St. Paul evolved his tribute to the Church as the Body of which the Risen Christ is the Head. The Colossian Epistle was penned to exterminate a spurious mysticism that threatened the theology and the morals of the small communion in the valley of the Lycus. This heresy was actuated by laudable motives, and dealt with attractive themes. The unknowableness of Deity, the infinite distance between the Creator and the emanations of His Being, and how the abyss could

be spanned: such were the impulses of an intellectual movement thoroughly characteristic of Oriental speculation. For these and similar inquiries the Apostle had one answer. The Person of Christ, as the Eternal Word, mediated Creation and Redemption; the Life of Christ, as the Incarnate Word, abolished the void between man and his Maker. There was no need to bestud this abyss with the figments of over-wrought imagination. Christ was forever pre-eminent in all spheres, visible or invisible, and His functions in the Church were but a part of His total sovereignty over the universe.

On this imposing foundation, St. Paul based his argument for the regeneration of the race through the Church, by virtue of the First-born from the dead, Who was supreme on every line either of divine or human activity. We have been content to leave the tribute as we find it, not only here, but also in the Johannine writings and in the Epistle to the Hebrews. The vaster music of the Incarnation has been lost in mundane discords; its infinitude has been narrowed down to a center for vague aspiration. Yet had the Church retained the resurgent faith of St. Paul in Jesus Christ as the one cohesive bond of material and spiritual creation, her internal troubles might have been avoided, and the long disastrous conflict between knowledge and faith perhaps could have found therein a satisfactory arbitration. In his Ephesian letter the Apostle emphasizes the orders of service in the Church as contributory to her unity, and declares that this unity is the grand goal of human existence. "And He gave some, Apostles; and some, prophets; and some, evangelists; and some, pastors and teachers; for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the building up of the body of Christ; till we all come into the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ" (Chapter 4: 11–13). Impressive and beautiful metaphors

are found elsewhere in this letter. We are no longer strangers and foreigners, but fellow citizens with the saints, and of the household of God, built upon the foundation of the Apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ Himself being the chief corner stone, in Whom all the building fitly framed together groweth into an holy temple in the Lord. The Church is the habitation of God through the Spirit. Christ meant her for Himself, and loved her with an everlasting love, and gave His life for her, that she might become a glorious Church, not having spot or wrinkle, or any such thing; but that she should be holy and without blemish (Chapter 2: 19–22; Chapter 5: 26–27). Even the angels who inhabit heavenly places adore the manifold wisdom of God as revealed in His Church (Chapter 3:10). Further quotations from other writers of the New Testament are forbidden for lack of space. They are open to all, known of all, and they corroborate the inviolable attachment of the authors to the unity of the Church as the historical monument of the Resurrection and the outflow of its power.

III.

Again, Christianity has been public property for many centuries and to know it aright we must read and understand the records of its past. However these are explained, it is first and last a supreme fact established in history and cannot be treated as a matter of private opinion. Theories did not create its importance; its importance created them. Therefore they should not detract from the reality of a faith which has found its objective existence, not in the cloister nor in the sanctuary, but in the world. The sources of these theories are many and various. The Semitic mind, which produced the New Testament; the Hellenistic, which produced ecumenical dogma; the Imperialistic, which produced the Papacy; the Feudal, which produced mediæval ec-

clesiasticism; the National, which produced Protestantism, were all alike involved in the service and exploitation of the Ecclesia. It is not necessary to do more than name them; their divers manners and deeds will at once suggest themselves to the intelligent observer. He will also detect beneath and through them all a vital organism, which has palpitated with powers and gifts men could do nothing less than obey. Even perverse minds were not able to overcome these dynamics, nor to extinguish the light God Himself had kindled. From the Apostolic period to the present awful hour, an hour of omen beyond the telling, a ceaseless progress of missionary conquests, expanding frontiers, higher ethics, and godly zeal has characterized the Church of Christ. Here on earth she has had union with Him, and o'ermastering sanctities have streamed from that mystic fellowship. The primitive beliefs of Christianity, which were delivered for all Time by its earliest teachers, have been registered and attested in creeds and formularies; in sacramental, legal and evangelical methods of appropriation and conveyance. Out of weakness, those who first announced the Christian dispensation were made strong. Notwithstanding persecution by the powerful and the contempt of the cultured, it gained that lodgment we justly revere, and enabled its disciples to perpetuate principles distasteful to the majority even of those who were moved by the grace of salvation to receive them. The Gospel overcame opposition of an apparently irremediable kind, not because it was upheld by an invincible system, nor by temporal authority, nor by skilful dialectic, but by reason of highly endowed spirits who shone in Christ's reflected light and moved in the radius of His perfected life, thus transmitting their influence on lesser men and women who were made obedient thereto. They were often few in number, but they were enough to carry on the witness, and they and their successors rescued the generations from the darkness of iniquity.

It is notable that these remnants held the New Testament ideal of the Church as being true and necessary. They did not speak of themselves as individuals, but as living stones in one spiritual structure; not as regenerated personalities alone, but as regenerated personalities incorporated into one Lord, one faith, one baptism. Wilful recreancy, imperfect knowledge, lack of sympathy, latent or active quarrels, could not mutilate the Body. Here, as everywhere, life counted for more than raiment; Divine life baffled the strategies of death; filled up the fissures in the tissues of creed and practice; and restored the energies spent in conflict. Not the clay, however unlovely and poor in quality, but the Potter, was the chief concern. He transfigured and molded it into vessels fit to contain the treasures of His will. Breath and being came from Him; apart from Him, the true Church in every age would have succumbed beneath the sheer weight of externalism. He flashed through depravity and mediocrity that gleam of celestial fire without which no development of holiness can prosper. The architecture of the new humanity was obscured but not obliterated. It regained its ascendancy in the Fathers whose names are grateful sounds in the household of faith; in the Pontiffs, the Schoolmen, the Saints, the Humanists, the Reformers, the Puritans, who in reality were one at the base and drank of the same brook by the way. Their Rock was Christ, the fruitage of their prodigious toil was decreed by their allegiance to Him. Their struggles, differences, resistances, even into blood, were not always tragical nor wearisome wanderings in shifting sands, far removed from the productive territories of well-directed effort. A sympathetic scrutiny sees in them the patience of the Everlasting Father with His children, to whom He had committed an infinite design, which was slowly advancing beneath the wear, tear and waste of evolutionary processes. The imperfections of its agents are everywhere apparent, and we sometimes take advantage

of these to accuse our forbears for the very ways by which they gave us the knowledge in which the accusation is cast. Of means of expression there was no stint, but practical attainments were hampered by circumstances. Yet notwithstanding these, it is undeniable that the mediaeval Church, to go no farther back into these providential recesses, gave mankind a higher unity which made feasible a universal loyalty. A sense of civic virtue and of social obligation which presently established better conditions pervaded eras we unwittingly dismiss as the Dark Ages. Could they reply, they might assert that few ages have ended in such darkness as our own, whose sun seems to be setting in a sea of blood. Master and man, teacher and student, trader and artisan, priest and people, prince and peasant, knew how to think and act together because they were attached to one catholic belief.

At the height of its career, Paris was the intellectual center of this union, as Rome was its political and ecclesiastical metropolis. The university of the former city dictated the theology of the Church at large, and even the Popes were careful about breaking a lance with her renowned doctors concerning dogmatic statements. The schools of Oxford, of Cologne, of Padua, of Bologna, were more completely cosmopolitan than any modern seats of learning. The high-water mark of material provision for education was reached when countries were decimated by plagues, insurrections and famines. The truce of God was arranged between kings and barons who vailed their crest to nothing except the decrees of the Church. Enthusiasms and asceticisms sprang up which were too generous or too severe to be permanent. The revulsion which follows weariness and the attempt to imitate the example of a Saint Francis or a Saint Theresa was accentuated by disappointment, uncertainty and distrust. Men were not anathema; they were sorely spent; unable any longer to realize the vision

which vanishes when it is neglected. Such enervation is still the human fate; the cycles of day and night continue, and though the one is not as welcome it is as natural as the other. Yet we are not at liberty to suppose that every good cause was wrecked or forsaken. When a brighter day dawned, and the shadows fled, men saw, not without astonishment, that throughout the long night preceding, a few faithful souls had kept their vigil, and that the apostolic order had never been entirely abolished. Those who were supreme and changeless in the midst of change stood nearest to God's right hand because they had testified, in season and out of season, to the oneness of the Church of His love in Christ Jesus.

We have no brief for the Holy See, which must forecast its duty toward the future in the light of its own past. But it should not be forgotten that Rome stood, during eight hundred years, not merely for righteousness, but for solidarity. "Her bishops," says an eminent Methodist historian, Dr. Herbert B. Workman, "were not only vicars of God; they were the symbols and the source of a brotherhood that would otherwise have perished. Men remembered their services; how they had tamed the barbarians, enforced law upon the lawless, preached the subordination of the individual to society, curbed the lust and despotism of kings, held up ideals of truth and purity in the darkest ages . . . maintained a unity of faith and hope in the days when all creed was in peril of disintegration." These achievements speak for themselves. Factionists who deem the Papacy a standing conspiracy against the liberties of mankind are not more correct than zealots for whom it is always and everywhere an infallible organization which should control the world. An unprejudiced criticism will discern even more clearly than the plenitude of partisan erudition that the weight of testimony is against these extremists and their opinions. Rome's reign was not in every instance inimical to the fellowship of faith. The great

Hildebrand's inflexible scheme was broken by the impact of ascensive nationalism, but can we recur to its audacity without a thrill of wonder and of admiration? He gave definite enunciation to the principles of solidarity, which assumed the stupendous form of a theocratic state, obtaining throughout the earth, over which he asserted his sway as the vicegerent of God. Temporal monarchs might not question the prerogatives of his office, since they were granted by the Deity Himself, to whom alone the Pontiff was responsible. Far from being content to leave these amazing propositions in the ineffectual region of protest, Hildebrand strove to make them operative, and to bring them into closest relation with an epoch of violent disruption and excess. Their obvious faults, such as clerical presumption, material ambition, and dexterous diplomacy, were counteracted by his personal character, which prevailed in the strange admixture of good and evil. No individual could have been selected who was better equipped to deal with his day. Sagacious, ardent, philosophical, politic, a reader of the hearts of men, a magnate of pure and consecrated life, indomitable energy, and tremendous will-power, he won at Canossa a victory which carried in it the seeds of defeat, but which, notwithstanding, is less offensive to Christian ethics than the depressing spectacle of modern Protestant doctors and clergymen who have invented apologies for ruthless cruelty and wrong. He invested the chair of St. Peter with a majestic reputation which awed anarchistic tribes, and he unified by subtle and spiritual means hosts of armed men who submitted to nothing else.

The same qualified praise can be ascribed to Innocent III, the noblest of the Popes, who, for eighteen years, enforced on Europe a higher morality, respect for the religious engagements of the Church, and a sense of common civilisation. The transfer of the Papal seat to Avignon in 1309 destroyed the sovereignty Hildebrand

had elaborated and Innocent was unable to maintain. Already crushed by the fall of the Holy Roman Empire, which it had wrought to its own dismay, the one tribunal of nations, whose decisions had hitherto been universally regarded, became reprobate. Rome discovered, too late, the Nemesis of her triumph over the House of Hohenstaufen in the widespread conviction that the building-up of nations was the future business of statesmen and the goal of history. There was nothing novel in this idea of national autonomy, though it had long lain dormant when the folly and wickedness of the Avignon schism resuscitated it. Without discussing further the respective merits of international absolutism vested in a Pontificate, and the benefits, so large and unmistakable, of the dissolution of mediaeval unity, suffice it to say that the decentralization of this regnancy was the result of an extended and arduous series of experiments. Dante's cyclopean denunciations of the sins of the Holy See, before which even the glories of Paradise faded; his repeated warnings and admonitions, his lamentations over the lost Ecclesia, his hope for her reconstituted unity, are the burden of the foremost spirit of a millennium. He was not alone in this basic attitude; Marsiglio of Padua, Abailard of Paris, St. Catherine of Siena, and other loyal members of the Church catholic mourned her defection and presaged its dire consequences. These came in full measure, pressed down and running over. The ecclesiastical system which had ministered through a universal symbolism to our fathers, had silenced Arnold of Brescia and well-nigh every other heretic, and at any hazard, had conserved orthodoxy in belief and practice, itself fell a victim to the artistically brilliant voluptuousness of the Renaissance Popes. Their refined sensualism and open infidelity were only purged away by the rebellion of one half of Christendom. The wounds then inflicted upon the Body of Christ have not been healed; the unity and catholicity forfeited under Boniface VIII and

Clement V have not been regained, nor have the Holy See or the Protestant Churches any overlordship today that can arrest the horrors of the current war which paralyses mankind.

IV.

If Protestantism is more favourable to wise and timely change, and not so sensitive that she must bleed to death at the loss of any one member, should she resent the abolition of boundaries which have served their purpose? Thoughtful souls are querying why there has been no closer alliance between Great Britain and Prussia, the birth-places of the Reformed faith, and what restraints that faith has imposed on duplicity and militarism? "There is a suspicion that we have limited the application of the Christian evangel and ethic to the requirements of a State at war and a popular mind inflamed by vengeance." The break-down of diplomacy is symptomatic of the collapse of religion in international affairs. Those who attribute it to segregated types of Christianity find their sentiments well-phrased in the lines of Robert Frost,—

> "Before I built a wall I'd like to know
> What I was walling in or walling out,
> And to whom I was like to give offense,
> Something there is that doesn't like a wall,
> That wants it down."

We are witnessing the mischievous outcome of that outrage on Christian consciousness which contradicted the feeling that divine life and righteousness are forever a unity and that we must embody that unity or lose our usefulness. As one writer has remarked, "The Protestant Churches will gain nothing by unity if they only reinforce their opposition to the Catholic idea of the Church and the Catholic ideal of worship. Romanism has failed to interpret Catholicism; the Oxford Movement in the Church of England, despite the many benefits it has brought to us all, just fails to accomplish all that is need-

ed, because of its entanglement with a mechanical theory of priesthood, the retention of magical ideas in its sacraments, and its tendency towards a reactionary theology! Just because the Protestant Churches are free, it is open to them to discover representative priesthood, mystical sacraments, and that type of theology which is interpreted throughout by the love of God and can be preached with passionate love to men. If we cannot reappropriate these things we shall be out for ever in the barren negations of Protestantism."

I am aware that throughout these vexed eras belief in liberty as an essential part of the good of all things, and dread of liberty as a dangerous innovation, were, as now, the polar instincts meeting there, as here and everywhere, in fierce antagonism. Yet is liberty always clearly apprehended? Does it not consist in obedience as much as in freedom of choice? Would not perfect obedience to a perfect rule mean perfect liberty? If such an idealization is logical, and if obedience is the first law of social progress, and if the ability to think as other Christians think, as well as think for ourselves, is a necessary art of Christian thinking, then we have to thank the mediaeval Church for the steady pressure of an authority, not always salutary in other respects, which taught through turbulent centuries this lesson of obedience to a supernormal revelation. It modified the very brain tissue of Christian peoples, and inculcated those psychic tendencies which have hitherto advantaged Protestantism as well as Catholicism.

Another interrogation is in order here. Can we always depend on that obedience and on those psychic tendencies? Have self-reverence and self-knowledge really led to self-control? Should it prove true that with the peerless gains of the Reformation, and its ultimate in Puritan independency, there has been a relaxation of discipline, what measures are we to adopt to recover loyalty to what St. Paul called "saving truth"? I have

long held it verifiable that the ethereal detachment of Puritanism is such that only superior men and women are able to overcome its neglect of outward and visible signs. The inward fortifyings of a profound spiritual experience of God, the reachings out into the infinite of a finite creature, are the occupations of strong and enduring natures, and when these moral and spiritual attributes decay, we have no sufficient support for our position. The Church as we define it must preserve her being; have continuity of principles, power of assimilation, and resistless vigour. No system or policy exists for its own sake, but for the sake of its subordination to life and for the generation of more life. Far be it from me to asseverate that the cure for these manifest ills is in any single medicine, but certain symptoms help in their diagnosis. A glacier-like movement from without is breaking in on provincial religion. Individualism and nationalism, the products of Protestantism, are at the bar, impeached for having endangered the protection of society. Divorced from religious control, subjected to the sheer atheism of physical supremacy, knowledge, culture, virtue, and faith plead for rescue by the reorganized family of God, animated by the spirit and life of Christ. It behooves us to beware not only of the war but of the close of the war. When the holocaust which has already consumed some vaunted dogmas as well as conceits and fancies shall end, then will the several religious sects, disengaged from their former pursuits, have to return to spiritual husbandry and find and apply their intrinsic resources of genius and character. The crisis is mounting; the time of searching and burning has arrived, when a deeper Gospel than the eulogies of the forefathers; a stern piety, stimulative of no platform applause; a seeking and a finding of wider solidarity than is acceptable to those who do not care to be disturbed even when disturbance means correction, are indispensable in evidence and expression of the Christian Church and her mission.

The first duty we owe to God and man is a lively realization of our humiliating backsliding. Instead of summoning the world to repentance, the Church herself should first repent. Whatever else we solicit, our foremost supplication should petition for that movement of the will of the Church towards the Will of God, which induces a change of her mind, and results in a change of her ways. Grief for our transgression, rather than for its shame or publicity; a grief which reviews the past with such intensity as to make an actual cleavage in human history, should be the concern of our united hearts. The chords of reconciliation and adjustment wait to be struck until this preliminary contrition has mellowed and subdued us. A frank and hearty acknowledgment and an abjuration of the needless causes of separation is next in sequence. These acts are sometimes liable to end in a sentimentalism which stops short of their practical details. If all the creditable emotions, lyrics, appeals for oneness which have been voiced in the various denominations had been translated into unifying measures, we should be much nearer that which they celebrated before it was born. One well-known communion revealed its ineptitude when a few years past it shied at proposals for federation with two or three sister Churches. Learned and eloquent pastors and divines uttered the familiar objections that they were dissimilar in origin, temperament, scholarship and the like. Their protestations sounded very thin and shrill after the affluent language of St. Paul, and their whole bearing seemed to me to be a flat contradiction of New Testament doctrine. No historic episcopate barred the way, and the participating Churches were alike in evangelical persuasion. But hereditary distinctions proved stronger than the innate democracy of Christianity. The truth is that confession and repentance are sometimes more difficult in saints than in sinners: and while we are irresolute, ancestral pride whispers in our ears the story of a dead past, and closes them to the im-

pending emergencies of a living future. Yet this is the path we should tread, the Damascene Road to peace and prosperity, which will only be followed beneath the urgency of the Holy Spirit's guidance, preparatory to still greater restitution and blessing. When the divided Church is converted to her Lord's conception of herself, she will ask of Him, What wilt Thou have me to do? Previously to that change, legalists and sectaries will doubtless enlarge upon the differences of Christians, and the huge embarrassments of their multiple forms. After it has occurred, the same teachers may become warm advocates of reunion, who shall assert that these formidable hindrances have been swallowed up in the returning tides of life and love.

Wandering along the estuary of the river Dee, in the summer of 1895, I chanced to see it nearly denuded of the waters of the Irish Channel. Long grey expanses of mud, on which rested stranded schooners and heavily laden barks, made a dull and prosaic scene. The sea birds hovered with plaintive callings over the desolation, until at last a welcome darkness fell and veiled it. But on the morrow the waters had returned; they covered the bed of the stream and welled upward and onward to break translucently on the golden strand above. The ships had floated out, and, with sails set and bent by a favouring wind, were dimly visible on the circle beyond, carrying their cargoes to desired havens. So is it with the Church when the fuller volume of her Lord's life rolls in upon her, lifting her embassies to motion and achievement; when that love again constrains her of which the Apostle spoke, the love which

> "Gives to every power a double power,
> Above their functions and their offices."

No longer will it be said that while nations can forgive and forget, and execute treaties and recast maps, the Church, which is the respository of universal brotherhood, can do none of these things. Let conviction seize

her, pain her, drive her to the central point of unquestioning surrender, and there will arise in her a determination which crucifies justifiable and venerable traditions and bewildering and painful memories; a determination capable of utmost sacrifice, casting down the idols of the tribes, and offering to their Lord a people for His own possession. No empty channels, no stranded argosies, will then mock her glorious claims and destiny. The entire project hangs on the spiritual revolution which has been briefly indicated, and the sooner we realize this the better for its success. Not by might, nor by power, but by the Spirit of God thus operative, will organic union be established. For that Spirit we must wait and pray in a combination of faith and labour.

Of course it is possible that for a space the Church will remain self-willed, obstinate, and more anxious to preserve her provincialism than to know the day of her visitation. But this hardness postpones the hope of her Divine Lord, and minifies His Intercessory Prayer. It is contrary to our common intention that such a dereliction should be, yet that it is, and that Jesus has been hurt in the house of His friends, is beyond a peradventure. Because of her divided counsels and internecine warfare, the Holy Catholic Church, which has neither been truly holy nor truly catholic, has infected the human consciousness with scepticism toward herself and toward her actual connection with supersensuous reality. God forbid that we should coquette with that scepticism by referring to the Ideal of Jesus as too beautiful and remote: an Ideal which must be accommodated to our infirmity by reducing its ineffable terms to denominational necessities! Let us rather candidly avow that we have failed to absorb that Ideal, and throw ourselves and our causes on Heaven's mercy. Beset on all sides by a renascent philosophy, theology, science, literature, social reconstruction, Churchmen of every type, now see their pretensions and claims subjected to the severest ordeals. The heart

of things as they are is being torn open and analysed. What existing ecclesiastical sects or sections will abide the hour of reckoning? Certainly not those which fondly imagine that they alone are the Lord's elect, and that the center of unity is in their restricted beliefs, any more than those which scent dangerous innovations in organic unity, and spurn its tentative overtures as either destructive on the one hand, or a counsel of perfection on the other. The fact is, and history confirms it, that great changes in the Church have been due to certain truths being given favourable or unfavourable consideration. The time was, for example, when Rome rejected Scholasticism and excommunicated its teachers. Now St. Thomas is the patron saint of her schools. Organic union formerly prevailed, then faltered and fell before the swift advance of the Renaissance. Now it has risen again, and will not relinquish its hold upon imagination and reason. We do not have to argue that there has always been an identity of manifestation in the Church of the past. Such an argument stains the conscience and stultifies the intelligence. Yet we can rationally assert that the liberty of Protestantism may be lawfully used to co-ordinate its beliefs in the rule of an organic Church and in the rights of the individual Christian's priesthood.

Admittedly this co-ordination is a process which challenges the energies of ecclesiastical statesmanship, but the Divine life which reigns in Protestantism is our sufficiency, and can heal the hurt of God's inheritance. No land offers a better opportunity or a more congenial climate for the masterly handling of the forces of that life than does the United States. Here are 169 distinct branches of the Church, nine-tenths of which are contained in nine related groups. The rest are scattered, some of them apparently indigenous to given localities and unable to survive beyond them. There are among them auspicious omens and some which are sinister.

We are profoundly thankful that the recriminations which once defiled their intercourse have been abandoned. The charity we have lauded governs their mutual understanding and ennobles their whole view of life. The second Spring has returned, the germinal growths of peace and good-will have greeted it. The viewless winds of the Spirit, which blow where they list, are softly breathing on the one garden of the Lord in this commonwealth, nor can they be excluded by theological fences. The Anglican and Presbyterian Churches have busied themselves with articles of union; Methodists, following the example of their Canadian and British brethren, are today discussing at the General Conference in Saratoga, terms of confederation with the Southern Church. Should this be gained, as now seems likely, it may become the hailing sign for the concentration of Evangelical Christianity.[1] Only a few years ago three of the minor bodies of English Methodism joined together to form the United Methodist Church, and within the last month, the Secretary of the Baptist Union of Great Britain and Ireland, the Rev. J. H. Shakespeare, as President of the National Council of the Free Churches, has propounded a comprehensive plan for the Federation of all such Churches, on the ground that their denominational divisions had no meaning for the present generation and were a positive hindrance to the triumph of the Gospel.

These gratifying indications by no means exhaust the story of our recession to the requirements of the New Testament. Historic Churches, such as the Lutheran and the Anglican, those sturdy custodians of given forms of faith and order, will have to be reckoned with in the general result. What if we are a heterogeneous population? All alike share in a free Church and a free State. Our propinquity occasionally increases friction, but eventually it reduces it. Roman and Protestant are in the

[1] The word comes as I write that the union is practically accomplished.

same life current, subject to the same unremitting streams of influence. Their resources are being syndicated for the spiritualizing of our civic centers and their betterment. The religious fervour, the ecclesiastical stability, the moral strength, the intellectual insight of the several Protestant denominations cannot be hidden from the brotherhood. None of them live unto themselves, few any longer covet the loss and chill of such an isolation. On the other hand, the hold which numerous fraternities and secret orders have obtained on the manhood of the nation has diverted from the Church an immense factor, and signifies her incapacity to satisfy the gregarious instincts of men who go beyond her to avow their devotion to mercy, justice and philanthropy. Surely there is bread enough and to spare in the Father's house for all His children, when we have reset the tables of the Lord. Again, unlicensed and popular evangelism has obsessed multitudes of souls. To say nothing of its doctrines, which are sometimes caricatures of sober Christian truth, its language and artificial emotionalism are self-condemnatory and seriously impair the great good it has achieved. A united Church could consecrate and invest these passional forces, which have had no previous outlet in religion, to better ends and purer results. Look where we may, within or without the Church: review as best we can the crystallization of various tendencies of thought and action, they point to one great need: an Ecclesia so secured in God, in the Risen Christ, and in religious history and experience, as to be capable of common life, common assertion, common control.

After the War, What?

By Charles H. Robinson, D.D.,
Editorial Secretary of the S. P. G.

As the war drags out its weary length the question presents itself with increasing urgency, In what direction may we hope to discern any means by which, when peace is at last restored, the unprecedented bitterness that this war has engendered can be assuaged and a reconstruction of relationships worthy of the name Christian can be accomplished? Are there any grounds for entertaining such hopes or expectations? We believe that an affirmative answer can be given to this question and that those who are young, as well as many who have already reached middle age, will live to see the creation of a better understanding between the inhabitants of England and Germany—to name the two nations which at the present moment are further estranged from one another—than has ever before existed.

We believe that the altruistic and Christian ideals which are recognized by a large number of the inhabitants of England and Germany will, in increasing measure, influence the thoughts and actions of the two peoples. If we were asked for a proof that a large number of German subjects recognized obligations towards other countries and other peoples we should be disposed to point to the long array of German missionaries, Protestant and Roman Catholic, who have gone forth within recent years to India, to China and to many different parts of Africa to labour on behalf of peoples the religious enlightenment of whom can have no direct effect upon the material welfare of Germany. Only those who have taken pains to study the

work of German Missions, or who have had the opportunity of seeing them in non-Christian lands, can realize how widespread is the support which they receive at home or what splendid work they have accomplished abroad. We believe that the best prospect of the reconstruction of a good understanding between the peoples of Great Britain and Germany lies in an increasing recognition of the ideals for the promotion of which British and German missionaries stand. There is good reason to hope that a great impetus will be given to the work of Christian Missions by the marvellous spirit of heroism and self-sacrifice which this war has developed in all countries concerned. This hope is based upon a study of what has happened in Christian and even pre-Christian times. Again and again in the history of the past it has been seen that war in its most terrible form has been the precursor of great forward movements in the moral and spiritual development of the life of nations.

To encourage ourselves as we look on into the future it may be worth while to recall some incidents which illustrate this statement.

Never before in the history of the world has it been as literally true as it is at the present moment that there is "upon the earth distress of nations with perplexity, the sea and the waves roaring, men's hearts failing them for fear and for looking for those things which are coming upon the earth". If in the events which are happening around us today we see a partial fulfilment of our Lord's prophecy, we can also appropriate to ourselves His words of encouragement, "When these things begin to come to pass, look up and lift up your heads, because your redemption draweth nigh." We are bold to believe that the war which now desolates the earth will be the prelude to a development of Christian Missions and an expansion of the Kingdom of God upon earth that will challenge comparison with any which occurred in the apostolic age or at any subsequent epoch.

The expansion of the Church of God has from the earliest days been directly or indirectly connected with wars and their immediate results. The day on which the present war was declared (August 1) was the day on which the Jews were engaged in commemorating the two thousand five hundredth anniversary of the destruction of their first temple. Its destruction paved the way for the spread of Judaism far outside Palestine, and during the troublous period which it inaugurated the Jewish prophets first realized with clear vision the missionary vocation of their nation. It was the dread of the Assyrians, whose cruelties and atrocities exceeded any which have been witnessed in the present war, that forced the Jewish prophets to realize the existence of a God greater than the gods of Assyria and One Who would not suffer physical force to become the supreme arbiter of the destinies of the nations.

Thus it came to pass that what must have seemed to many irretrievable loss was transmuted into spiritual gain, alike for the Jewish nation and for the world. At a later period, after the war which ended in the destruction of their last temple and in their more complete dispersion, the visions of their prophets began to receive their fulfilment, and the blessings that the Jews had received in trust for mankind began to be made known to the world. For it was the dispersion of the Jews which rendered possible the conversion of their theocracy into the universal Christian Church.

It is less easy to point to the good that resulted from the long series of wars which have disgraced the nominally Christian nations of Europe since the break-up of the Roman Empire. In the case of the wars of the Crusades the chief resultant gain was the evolution of a spirit of self-sacrifice and chivalry which prepared men and women to respond to the call to devote themselves to a nobler and more spiritual warfare, when at last this call became audible to them.

In more recent times also we can trace a connection between wars and the development of a spirit of self-sacrifice which has found scope for its manifestation in fresh efforts to promote the establishment of Christ's Kingdom throughout the world.

The first missionary society started in England, entitled "The Corporation for the Propagation of the Gospel in New England", was founded in 1649 at the close of the Civil War. It was founded by the English parliament at the instigation of Oliver Cromwell and still continues to do good work amongst the Indians in Canada.

The Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts was founded in 1701, in an interval between two long and exhausting wars in which Great Britain was engaged. Between 1792 and 1804, when the Napoleonic wars were raging, no less than five British societies whose aims were of a missionary character were founded. These included the other great Anglican society, the C.M.S.

The circumstances under which the British and Foreign Bible Society was founded in 1804 have been thus described by one of its local secretaries:

"It was on March 7th in the year 1804, when Napoleon was waiting for his six hours' mastery of the English Channel, that our forefathers founded what is now the great British and Foreign Bible Society.

"It was a time almost of panic; men distrusted our wooden walls and hearts of oak; 3 per cent. Consols had fallen as low as £54½; the quartern loaf cost 1s. 5½d; and th re was snow in some parts of the country over ten feet deep, so that the sufferings of the poor were indescribable. The Government had issued regulations for the preservation of good order in case of an actual invasion. Horses stood ready harnessed to whirl away at a moment's notice the treasure of t] Bank of England to the crypt of Worcester Cathedral; all Lon n was one vast armed camp.

" ese were the days—days of trial and anxiety and troubles, of which no man could foresee the issue—when in the counting house of a good London merchant, Mr. Hardcastle, a little room overlooking the Thames at Old Swan Stairs, a few godly men met together and founded a Society which should have as its object the advancement and betterment of all the nations."

Coming down to more recent times, we find that the years which immediately followed the Civil War in Amer-

ica were characterized by a wave of missionary enthusiasm to which there had been no parallel in American history. In the period which immediately followed the Franco-German war, notwithstanding the terrible financial distress from which France was suffering, there was an unprecedented expansion of Roman Catholic Missions supported by the French together with a corresponding expansion of the Protestant Missions in France.

Those of us who believe that the cause of Christian Missions is the cause of God and that the faith of Christ, which it is the object of Missions to proclaim, affords the only hope of establishing peace and goodwill amongst all the races of mankind, cannot but ask with anxious enquiry what is likely to be the effect of the present world cataclysm upon the Missions of the Christian Church. Have we any reason to hope that what happened 100 years ago in England, fifty years ago in America, and forty years ago in France will happen again throughout Europe? We cannot forecast the future or attempt any definite prophecy as to what will take place, but there are at least some grounds for expecting that the termination of the present war will usher in a new era alike in the recognition and acceptance of Christian principles at home and in the development and expansion of Christian Missions abroad.

In the first place, we may comfort ourselves with the knowledge that in Germany the bond of union which unites those who have been the supporters of Foreign Missions to those who are striving for the same object here remains unbroken. Dr. Mott, who spent a considerable time in Germany after the beginning of the war, writes (in an American review):

"This struggle has revealed as nothing else could have done the strength of the world-wide missionary movement. The missionary movement and the Christian Student Movement are the only movements which preserved their solidarity. . . . The moment this nightmare of war is behind them they will go forward together in the common constructive work of the world. I have seen the greatest miracle the world has ever seen. It is the one that the enemies of Christianity had in mind in the early days of Christianity

when they could explain everything else except 'how these Christians love one another!' I know not simply individuals here and there, but hundreds of people, who behind each others' backs on both sides of this tragic turmoil are showing by their prayers, and by their deeds and by their silence, their love for one another. How many meetings of intercession I have engaged in in these last few months, in which I have heard English and Scotch praying for the Germans, and Germans pouring out their hearts for their brothers in this missionary work and the Student Movement. If I had no other evidences of Christianity I have had enough new evidences brought into my experience in these last months to convince me that Jesus Christ not only was, but is, the Saviour of the world. He not only commands that we love our enemies, but He makes it possible."

One of the saddest thoughts connected with this war is that of the harvest of illwill and mutual misunderstanding which must result between the nations which are now fighting. If, as we earnestly pray, the English and German peoples are to come to understand and appreciate each other, this result will not come about as a result of closer trade or commerce, but it may be brought within reach by the citizens of the two countries who are united to each other in the service of a common Lord and Master.

The following incident which was reported in the *Westminster Gazette* (Nov., 1914) may serve to illustrate this thought. A soldier at the front who was a member of the Salvation Army, describing a charge in which he took part, wrote:

"We scrambled into the open and rushing forward were met by a perfect hail of bullets. . . . On our way back to the trenches I saw a poor German soldier trying to get at his water-bottle. I knelt down by his side. Finding that his own water-bottle was empty, I gave him water from mine. Somewhat revived, he opened his eyes and saw my Salvation Army button. His drawn face lit up with a smile, and he whispered in broken English, 'Salvation Army? I also am a Salvation soldier.' . . . We both shed a few tears . . . and then I picked up his poor broken body and with as much tenderness as possible carried him to the ambulance. But he was beyond human aid. When I placed him on the wagon he gave a gentle tug at my coat. Thinking that he wanted to say something I bent low and listened, and he whispered, 'Jesus, safe with Jesus.'"

One of the most formidable tasks which will confront us when the war ends will be to banish the recollection of

the expressions of hate which have been so widely circulated. There is no means by which we are more likely to do this than by emphasizing our common obligations and our common endeavours to promote the expansion of what a German missionary recently described as the "supranational Kingdom" to which, he added, "we all belong."

Mutual hatred would become impossible if we could transfer our standpolnt in imagination to the sphere of action to which countless numbers of those who have been fighting against each other during the last two years have now passed. In proportion as we realize the scene which is being enacted just beyond the limits of our present vision can we rightly interpret the present situation and gather hope alike for the near and the distant future.

As we read the long lists of casualties, printed each day in our daily papers, and realize that these have to be multiplied many times in order to include the losses sustained by the twelve countries now engaged in war, we cannot but ask ourselves the question, What of the future of the great multitude of soldiers who, as hour succeeds to hour, are crossing the river of death that divides this life from the next? Very many of those who have died have died the death of heroes, but few have lived a saintly life. When, as we cannot help doing, in the case of those whom we have known or loved, we try to follow them in thought across the river of death, what can we reverently conjecture in regard to the work which there awaits them? Judging by the sudden cessation of illwill which occurs between those who have been wounded whilst fighting, we are certain that no personal hatred between those who have been engaged on opposite sides in this war will outlast death. Such illwill will have disappeared before the river of death is approached. At the same time we can find nothing in the Bible which authorizes us to believe that this river will wash away the stains which the indulgence in cruelty and lust and pride have left upon the

characters of many, including some who are to be found on both sides in the present war. There is nothing in the Bible to suggest that death will effect any change in human character whether for good or evil. If this be true, and if good is to be finally triumphant over evil, the tendencies towards evil which exist here will have to be vanquished and destroyed on the other side of the river of death. In whatever way we interpret the Apocalypse it seems clear that this is one of the lessons which it was intended to teach.

As we strain our eyes and attempt to descry the scene which is being enacted on the other side of the river, we seem to see a conflict in course of being fought out which by its magnitude and by the greatness of the issues that are at stake, dwarfs into comparative insignificance every war that has been waged upon this earth. It is not being waged with material weapons and the combatants on either side belong to all races and tongues and peoples. Many who have fought on opposite sides on earth are fighting on the same side there. The conflict in which they are engaged has for its object the complete triumph of our Saviour Jesus Christ which will be manifested in the transformation of the characters of men. Do we ask, What are the means by which victory may be secured and what the qualifications which the successful combatants must acquire? The answer is that two of the chief qualifications for rendering effective service in this conflict are the capacity for self-sacrifice and the power of sympathy. The first of these qualities this war has helped to develop to an extent which a short time ago would have seemed inconceivable. In the case of those who have died we believe that the spirit of self-sacrifice, acquired and developed here, will fit them to act as effective soldiers in the struggle against sin and selfishness which is going on in the life beyond death. It is hard to think of any other ordeal which could have produced the same result on so large a scale and in so short a space of

time. The writer of one of the old Vedic hymns of India says: "I may conquer a thousand thousand men in battle, but he who conquers himself is the great victor." We thank God for the measure of success which He has granted to our arms. We thank Him also that many on both sides of the present struggle and amid the clash of material warfare have won that greater victory of which the old Indian speaks.

But if self-sacrifice, such as is exhibited in the life and death of a soldier, be one of the qualities which will be most needed hereafter, what are we to say of the other qualification to which we have referred? We cannot help a bad man to become good, a selfish man to become unselfish, or a cruel man to become kind, unless, having first gained for ourselves the spirit of our Master, we can approach him with Christlike sympathy. The power to sympathize with those who differ from us in language, in thought and in customs, how is it to be acquired? How may we attempt to develop it in this life in order that we may fit ourselves to become effective co-workers with God in another life?

The answers to these questions are closely connected with the recognition and fulfilment of the missionary obligation. There is no sphere of activity which tends to develop to a greater extent the power of sympathy than does the work of Christian Missions. The missionary who does not find his power of sympathy developing day by day as he prosecutes his work is a failure. The supporter of Christian Missions at home who does not find that his efforts to labour and pray for foreign Missions tend to make him sympathetic and loving towards all, has equally failed to fulfil his vocation. There is a need to raise the ideals, not merely of missionaries in the field but of workers on behalf of Missions at home. Those at home are not accomplishing their duty if they are content with glancing through a missionary magazine—some even of the clergy do not do as much as this—or attending or

speaking at missionary meetings. If they are to allow the missionary work of the Church abroad which is being carried on in their behalf to produce on their characters the effects which it ought to produce, they must unite themselves to those who are working in the mission field by the closest bonds of sympathy.

The call which comes to all Christians to take part in the extension of the Church in all lands and amongst all races, is the call and the opportunity to develop to its highest range the power of sympathy which, united to the gift of self-sacrificing courage, will fit men to take part in the work which God is preparing for them to do hereafter. Sympathy for others, and specially for those for whom it is natural to entertain an aversion, is at once a cause and an effect of missionary enthusiasm. Before a man can rouse himself to fulfil the missionary obligation he must himself have responded to the appeal of divine Love. The realization of this Love will beget within him missionary enthusiasm and his efforts to find an outlet for his enthusiasm will create the power to sympathize with all men. Missions tend to create sympathy not only towards those for whom the work is undertaken, but amongst those by whom it is undertaken, and it is this latter consideration which encourages us to believe that the missionary-hearted persons in Great Britain and Germany will make an important contribution towards the creation of a good understanding between the two nations.

Amongst the missionary magazines which it is part of the writer's duty to read, are those published by German missionary societies. Some of those lately issued contain reports and portraits of missionaries, or missionary students, who have been killed in the war, together with extracts from letters received from them, written in many instances from the trenches at the Front. It is impossible to read these letters and to entertain any kind of doubt that their writers honestly and completely believed that in fighting on behalf of Germany they were doing the will

of God. Moreover, the God of whom these letters speak is not the tribal God of the German nation, in the existence of whom many of their countrymen believe, but is the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Saviour and Redeemer of the whole world.

It may well be the case that, when this war ends, German missionaries and the supporters of German Missions will help to bridge the chasm that will divide their country from ours, and will help to bring our countrymen and theirs together again as friends and as fellow-workers for the Kingdom of God. A friend of the writer who was conversing with a sergeant as he was recrossing the English Channel to rejoin his regiment, after listening to the appalling stories of the sufferings which those at the Front were enduring, said to him, "For what purpose is all this waste?" The man's reply, given without an instant's hesitation, was, "No single life is wasted. It is not waste. It is sacrifice. It is for the sake of the children. It is going to make the world a far better place for them than it has ever been for us."

His words are applicable to all engaged in the present struggle, who are sacrificing their lives in the belief that they are striving to promote the wellbeing of others.

It cannot be that the multitudes on either side, who are inspired by the highest ideals, can forever fail to appreciate each other's motives, or refuse to put aside their ill-will and misunderstandings. Must we wait till death enlightens the eyes of the separate individuals of both races, or is there no means by which we can hope to anticipate this result? Is it too much to hope that the two nations in Europe which in the past have been most distinguished for their missionary activities may be drawn closer to each other by their common efforts to promote the establishment of God's "supranational" kingdom upon earth?

If we are to sacrifice our selfish interests and our personal ambitions in order to carry to the uttermost parts

of the earth the knowledge of our Saviour's love; if we are to prepare ourselves and our countrymen for the future which awaits us, we need to deepen in ourselves now, before the war ends, the sense of obligation under which our country lies to become a missionary nation.

Modern history will date from 1914. May God grant that, as a result of the fresh efforts which we are resolved to make, the expansion of Christian Missions throughout the whole world may date from the same year.

Aggressiveness in Christian Advance

By Francis J. McConnell, D.D.,
Bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church, Denver.

A celebrated American explorer was once asked what he did when in doubt and in danger of becoming lost. His reply was, "When in doubt, I go ahead." To be sure the explorer expected his hearer to put in the necessary qualifications. He did not go ahead without having done all possible to get information about the trackless lands before him. Nor was his going ahead just a blind lunging out toward the unknown. After having gained all possible knowledge he solved his remaining doubts by the method of aggressive advance.

It is but a commonplace to say that Christianity is by the very law of its life a system making for spiritual exploration. It is set to discover spheres of possible Christian achievement. It seeks to find and reveal the will of God in individual character, in social relationships, in the better organization of the Christian bodies into a veritable Body of Christ, in the seizure of the non-Christian peoples through the Gospel. But the present world catastrophe has shocked the Christian world into something horribly suggesting a paralyzing doubt. With half the world on fire with war, "What is the use"? What is the use of preaching individual and social and international righteousness? Is not this a time for us to stop

in the midst of our accustomed Christian activities,—so-called,—until we can find where we are?

The answer to this question is the answer of the explorer. When in doubt we are to go ahead. Christianity offers no solution of doubt to one who stands still. The only place of certainty in the Christian system is in the forefront of the advance. Christianity is a poor system when taken in any half-way terms. While men and systems must pass through half-way conditions on the path to something higher and better, there is no half-way post at which we can stop and remain Christian. Christianity could commit no greater mistake in the present crisis than to consent to any slowing down of her forces.

All that is vitally true in Christian doctrine comes into human thought out of the doing of the will of God. The Christian does not find his way to truth merely by the exercise of the intellectual faculties. Intellect indeed plays a great part, but it plays that part by dealing with facts which well up in Christian consciousness through the will to do the will of God. At the very beginning of the Christian life there must be a venture of faith, a willingness to follow a divine command, a putting forth of the energies toward one course rather than toward another. While only an out-dated psychology would teach that will and intellect and feeling are as separable as if they came out of distinct compartments, it is nevertheless true that in knowing there is a certain primacy of will. Before we can know anything worth knowing there must be a will to know, and before we can know Christian truth in any real fashion there must be the will to do. The Christian assumes some things as true and ventures out upon this assumption. We test the truth of Christianity by its total consequences as we work the system out into life,—and by total consequences we mean inner as well as outer consequences. We begin the Christian life as we begin any

other phase of life,—by accepting the principles of the system as true, by trying them out in experience, and by dealing with specific doubts as they specifically arise. But if anything checks the course of the life the resulting faith and certainty begin to grow dim. Where there is much Christian doing there is much Christian believing. Where there is little activity there is much doubt. We dare not stop. What source of light and certainty is there for the Christian apart from the certainty born out of doing the will of God? Scientific inquiry taken as a substitute for faith raises more problems than it solves. Formal logic is a barren manipulation of terms except as we "load" the premises,—and doubters have not much with which to load the premises. Apart from the corrections of practical experience religious feeling floats away from the earth and leads to reactions full of the blackest despair. Dark as the present world crisis may be we are shut up to going ahead if we move at all. We are like explorers who have sailed too far out of sight of land to turn back, and who must perish of hunger and thirst if they anchor. There is no way of safety but straight ahead.

The need in the present crisis then is for a more insistent and aggressive type of Christianity in all its forms of activity. Take first the individual. This would be a poor time for the individual to pray less. The call is for more prayer. This would be the worst of times for any slackening of the ideals of individual piety. Since social and international righteousness takes its start in the individual heart the ideals of the individual should be higher today than ever before. Why should there be any shrinking from taking the Master's own ideal that men are to be perfect even as the Father in heaven is perfect? We are not pleading for a return to the doctrines of any of the various schools of perfectionists who have appeared now and again in the history of the Church. We are pleading, however, for nothing short of perfection

in conduct as an ideal of daily practice. According to Jesus the ideal of perfection is a practical ideal. The Father sendeth his rain upon the just and upon the unjust and causeth his sun to rise on the evil and on the good. The command here is not toward a mystic experience, or toward a consciousness that all sinful tendency has been removed, but toward an even-handed unselfishness which manifests itself in love and justice to all. The path on toward that ideal is the only path of Christian certainty and safety. Say all we please about the impracticability of such an ideal it is after all the only practicable ideal. It contains the only promise of so purifying the streams which arise from the individual life and opinion as to make the recurrence of horrors like the present impossible. The root trouble with men is that they crave after more than their share of sunshine and rain. Could we trust the Christianity of the present day to take over the control of the sunshine and the rainfall? The difficulty is that individual believers have not yet been willing to go the full length with their Christianity. The Christian principle as set forth by Jesus seems to imply that in any case of doubt in the application of the Christian principle we are to try a fuller application of the principle. If a man compels us to go one mile we are to go two. The Christian measure is to be heaped and running over. It may very well be that in particular circumstances even the best men cannot realize the Christian principle of going the full length, but that is no reason for surrendering perfection of love and of justice as the ideal toward which action should conform. It is one thing to do the best we can when we are striving toward a high ideal. It is another to make "doing the best we can" the avowed ideal.

Suppose we look next at the relation of Christianity to the social questions of our time. There is no need of advocating any particular propaganda to make our point

clear. The only way to decide whether Christianity has any relief for the social disorders of the time is to apply Christianity in full. We must not forget that wars come out of false social conceptions. Whither can desperate and headlong commercial competition lead except to war? Society must eventually be organized around some co-operative principle. Competition between individuals and communities is healthy enough when the competition is merely that of a friendly and sportsmanlike rivalry, but not when it aims at seizure of material goods. Radical Christianity will indeed be wary of tying itself to any of the present-day schemes of social improvement, but Christianity must remain radical to point the only way out. The final Christian ideal for society is one of organized brotherliness. There is in the Christian society as we find it today a great deal of sporadic brotherliness, but there has been very little attempt to organize brotherliness even in Christian communities. Before there can be social re-organization around a co-operative principle there will have to be a large preaching of the doctrine of human brotherhood,—a preaching that will go the full length. Christianity has too long proclaimed the doctrine of a sort of potential brotherhood, as it has too long proclaimed a doctrine that men are potentially sons of God. Men are inherently brothers of one another. Men are fundamentally sons of God. This does not alter the fact that some of our brothers are unworthy and that some of the sons of God are prodigal, but it does put upon Christianity the responsibility for every form of redemptive initiative. If the Christian doctrine of brotherhood can once be taken at anywhere near its full value the social re-organizations will come quickly,—and will come without deadly shock. It will be remembered that the condemnations uttered by Christ were very often for those who had not rightly assessed a human value. What was the sin of Dives? That he was hard-hearted toward everyone? A celebrated min-

ister once preached a sermon to show that Dives improved under a course of discipline. The point was that when Dives came into the place of torment he began to show an interest in the welfare of his brothers. It is possible, however, to read the parable from an altogether different angle. Dives seems to have been a pleasant enough sort of man in this life; there is no reason to think he was not kind to his brothers. The fatal mistake in the life of Dives was his attitude toward Lazarus. He did not think of Lazarus as a brother, or as a friend, or even as a human being of any consequence. In the second part of the parable Lazarus had the same place in the view of Dives that he had in the first. When Dives felt himself tormented in the flame he would have Lazarus,—whose wish about the matter was not even to be consulted,—make the journey into the place of torment just for the sake of relieving Dives! The inhumanity of a half-way view of men must give place to the full view of them as brothers of one another and sons of God. If talk of brotherhood seems cant it seems so only because there has been so much of such talk which has not been serious. But is there any safety in remaining in a non-serious state, or in going back to a state less serious? To ask such questions is to answer them. The only Christian course is straight ahead, taking the doctrine of brotherhood with entire seriousness. Let him who is tempted to doubt the efficacy of Christianity for modern social conditions devote his strength to insisting that Christianity have a full chance! Neither in social nor international relationships has Christianity yet had a chance. The only chance thus far has been with individuals,—some of whom have set forth a high ideal of saintliness in the sphere of the personal relationships. But neither in the realm of the social nor the international relationships has the Christian system yet appeared. The path must be forward and not back. To stay where we are is intolerable. To go back is im-

possible. The only road is forward to organization of societies and nations around the conception of brotherhood.

All this has bearing on the missionary task which confronts the church. The progress of events in the past few months has forced men to see that the problem of the relationship between the so-called higher and so-called lower nations is one that must be solved before the world can have prospect of permanent peace. The exploitation of the less-favored by the better-favored nations must cease, and the problem of the contacts between the two must be solved. Here again the only path of safety for Christianity is straight ahead. The only motive worth mentioning in the appeal for missionary conquest is the appeal based on human brotherliness. It is legitimate indeed to speak in a missionary address of the coal-beds in China which will come to utilization under Christian systems if the speaker has in mind the good of China rather than of outside capitalists. It is legitimate to say that this or that land needs Christianity to give it stability of political conditions if by that is meant the stability which looks more and more to the rule of the people over themselves. But in the past there has been all too little appeal to the Christian world for help for heathen peoples based just on the welfare of those peoples themselves. Phillips Brooks never uttered a profounder word than when he declared it to be the business of Christianity to take the Lord Jesus to Japan and then leave Him there, allowing the Japanese in the end to work out their own forms of Christianity. Is there yet enough trust in men and in the Gospel on the part of Christianity to adopt such a policy? Is there enough of willingness to introduce Christianity into an alien land with no other thought than to allow Christianity to run its own course in that land? This does not mean the withdrawal of missionaries, but it does mean that the missionary is not to make Chinese over into

Americans in their Christianity or peoples of India over into English churchmen. The truly Christian conception is that the Christ is to deal with the peoples in such way as to make His distinctive contribution to them and that they in turn are to make their distinctive response to Him. This means above all else that the Christian peoples are to respect the growing independence of the lands more recently won to Christ. The ideal for the relationship of men to God is that of sons to a heavenly father. The idea of the relationship of man to man is that of brotherliness. A particular missionary may indeed be fatherly toward his flock, but the attitude of the church at home toward the church abroad must grow away from the thought of any sort of overlordship, however, fatherly, to that of brothers meeting on a plane of Christianity. Conditions may not seem ripe for the realization of such a conception yet, but that is the full length to which Christianity must one day come, and that day may not be far off.

Has not this doctrine of the straight course ahead as the path out of doubt some meaning for the progress of the churches toward closer union? It is of course very easy to over-emphasize the separateness of Christian bodies from one another and to speak of them as if their divisions were marks of a contentious spirit. The churches are not fighting with one another. But the spirit of good feeling which prevails among the churches is not mirrored in any closeness of relationship which makes an adequate impression of unity upon those outside Christianity. There must be advance to some more material unity which will include within it the diversities of a richly varied Christian life. Who would think of going backward to the scandalous conflicts that raged between church organizations in other days? Who would think of stopping where we are? What course is there then but straight ahead? Is it not lack of faith in Christianity and in Christians to hold back from the closer approach?

Cannot we trust one another to guard in a spirit of love all the factors of Christianity which are worth preserving? The spirit which makes toward closer relationship among the churches is the spirit which would preserve those so-called minority factors which are really worth while. If the movement for unity should be blocked and old conflicts reopened the weaker bodies would suffer loss. If the growth toward unity goes on in the Christian way it will in the end be seen to have preserved everything worth while. The need of the hour is for Christians still more fully to trust one another.

This then is a day for advance. As we look abroad to the nations in conflict we may well be discouraged, but Christians are explorers and explorers should never know discouragement. It may be that in the spiritual realms we are at the beginning of an era like that which followed the discoveries of the time of Columbus. It will be remembered that when the Turks got astride of the world-old trade routes between Europe and the Orient it seemed to many thinkers as if the end of all things was at hand. How could the world of the West survive being cut off from the East? But it will be remembered also that the path to the East was recovered in a way that thwarted the devastating Turks. Certain leaders who had gathered together into practical formulas all the geographical wisdom of their day made one final venture on their knowledge and recovered the East by sailing west. What seemed to be supreme folly proved to be supreme wisdom. It may seem to many of us that we have since August of 1914 been cut off from our spiritual East. Instead of trying to recover the east by the old and worn paths of compromise and half measures, why not turn squarely toward the open sea of faith in spiritual principle? Why not take Christianity as worth its face value? Why not give it a chance? The result of such faith would be the recovery of everything we have apparently lost, the conquest of a larger

world, the establishment of a Christian belief on even more solid foundations. But all this requires a type of spiritual hardihood like that of explorers in all ages, —the hardihood which dares to solve doubts by going ahead.

The Mystery and Might of the Word

By The Most Reverend Evdokim,
Russian Archbishop of North America[1].

All things in the world have their history. So has the Word. As the servant, and to a smaller degree a teacher of the Word, I wish to draw everyone's attention to the history of the Word which is so near to every man's heart, whether he be highly educated or altogether ignorant.

People say, The Word is as old as the world. But I say,—No, it is older than the world. The Word was when there was no world such as we know it. It first resounded when this world had no existence. The dead silence of the darkness over the abyss was interrupted forever by the first mighty Logos: Let there be light!

When I contemplate this world which no mortal eye can encompass, monstrous in its dimensions, and in its power still almost wholly unknown to us; when I review thousands and thousands of men of genius, who fell in their effort to understand the secrets of this world; when I mentally realize that at first this word did not exist, with its endless powers, mysteries and puzzles,—then can I find no words in human language with which to worship worthily the bodiless Word which called forth these innumerable worlds out of nothingness and which still holds them in its mightiness.

Was there ever a mortal able to speak of the greatness, the force, and the might of this Word?

[1] Translated by Vera Johnston.

The greatest catastrophe which earth has ever witnessed befell humanity. Humanity was banished from paradise; humanity was to pursue its ultimate goal, to walk towards the object of life by two distinct paths. Let us first consider the path allotted to heathenism, reviewing its titanic labours.

Man is the whole world condensed. He is the microcosm. More than this, he is the microtheos. He is the image of God. He is "as God" on earth. Yet the researches of scientists depict the primitive life of this "microtheos" in such an attractive way. Gloomy and unseemly, according to them, was the life of primitive man. And yet in spite of it all, man ever was the image of God on earth, the creator of his own life. It is not in vain that I said he was the "creator". We are the creators, the Word is the creature. Man did create his own life, with all its complex surroundings, but his creation was different from the creation of the eternal Logos in this, that he could create his world out of material which was all around him, all ready to hand. Every new work, every discovery of man, was preceded by the idea, by the logos. Man's progress in the conquest of the world is nothing but a series of ideas being incarnated in actual life. We may say it is the realization, the embodying of the human spirit in works. The Word supplies thought with wings which enable it to descend to the depths of the ocean and the bowels of the earth, and to soar up to the stars. The life of man with all its conquests in the various regions of knowledge, the culture, material as well as spiritual, is the visible record of his thought, his desires, his longings, the annals in which are written the result of the labours undertaken by his immortal, his godlike spirit. It is the book of his acts.

When travelling in Egypt I stood at the foot of the great pyramid of Cheops. This is an enormous edifice. It is a whole mountain built up by human hands. And

as I looked at this huge pile of stone, the cold, inert mass began to live before me. And I saw back of it living human beings, their ideas, their emotions, for it was their thought and their will which built the artificial mountain, guiding hundreds of thousands of labouring menials.

Long is the record of humanity's exterior activity. Complicated is the historical process of man's development. Out of the book of these records many pages have been torn, and no scientist on earth is able at present to restore their meaning. But that alone which has reached our day bears witness to such an over-powering activity of the Word that the mind is stunned in its effort to imagine the titanic achievement. But, however great man's exterior activity, the records of his purely spiritual creativeness are still greater. The Word of man in the remotest times attained to such heights that before them in the present day and generation we stand dumbfounded. Since the remotest times, the history of human life has had behind it the Logos, the Idea and the Word. The Word was ever considered to be the essence of the world. All the writings of antiquity bear out this idea. Lao-tsze says:

"The most powerful in the world is that which is not visible, not palpable, not audible."

The Buddhist teacher says:

"It is necessary for us often to remind ourselves that our true life is not the exterior material life which takes place here on earth in our sight, but the inner life of our spirit, for which the visible life is nothing but the scaffolding used to protect the growth of our spirit. The scaffolding in itself has but a temporary destination, after the fulfilment of which it becomes entirely useless and may turn into an obstacle."

The wise man of Persia says:

"All things of the world belong to me, creation and destruction take place at my will. The world is the shell, I am the kernel."

In the Veda we read:

"There is one supreme intelligence exceeding all human intelligences. It is far and it is near. It penetrates all the worlds and

at the same time it is infinitely above them. Man sees that all things are contained in the supreme spirit, that the supreme spirit penetrates all creatures."

In the Rama-Krishna we read:

"When we see rain water flowing through the pipes it appears as if it came from the pipes, whereas in reality it falls from heaven. Likewise with the holy sayings of godly men. It seems that they come from them, yet in reality they come from God."

The Talmud says:

"The soul of man is the life of God."

Here are some remarkable sayings of Socrates:

"Doubtless it is true that if I had no bones and no muscles and other similar things, I could not do what I consider to be right. But it would be entirely untrue to affirm that the cause of that which I do is in my bones and my muscles, and not in the love of good. To speak thus means not being able to discriminate the cause from that which is inseparably connected with the cause."

Let us recall a few ideas of the philosophers of ancient Greece. Heraklitus teaches that the Logos is the intelligent, spiritual, common source of all life. Anaxagoras preaches the extra-cosmic intelligence, the *nous* as the original motor force of the homoiomeries inert in themselves. Plato considers that the true being is not of this bright-coloured, motley, ever-changing, ever-disappearing world, but of the ideas alone; subjecting the ideas mutually, he puts at the head of this world the idea of the supreme good which for him is the only true, real, perfect world. The Stoics teach the Logos penetrating all things as honey penetrates the comb. Their teaching of the many logoi is absorbingly interesting; according to them all things in this world develop from these separate logoi as separate, definite organisms develop from seeds. In fact, the Stoics preached decisively the pan-logism, leaving not a manifestation in our world unconnected with the original principle. Going from the cosmic into the human, we can quote Virgil in his *Æneid*:

"The people look reverently at the serious-faced orator, strong in service. All stood silent, straining their hearing. Through his word he was reigning over the minds and softening hearts."

For all that, throughout long centuries, human endeavours to solve the secret of life remained without result. But lo, across the huge impassable chasm between man and God an indestructible bridge was drawn. The stormy gloom of the abyss of sins was once more lit up by the light of God. Once more, the divine Logos descended to earth. The task of the Logos was now to create a new world on the ruins of the old. What were, then, the powers which could regenerate the decrepit world on the brink of perdition?

When the great tempter, trying to tempt the Lord in the desert, offered to Him the simplest and the surest means to draw around Himself all humanity, the calculation was simple enough and logical enough. To this day the great majority of people strive for the sake of a piece of bread. If you feed, if you clothe, if you supply man with material well-being, you conquer his heart. Yet the Saviour rejected this offer, for in the new spiritual kingdom the souls of men cannot be secured by bread alone.

Further, the tempter offered miraculous Asceticism to attract all men ensuring their devotion by miracles. This was a grand means, showing great worldly wisdom. There are many, able to behold the power and the meaning of life only in the unusual, willingly following those in whose hands they find the mysterious and the incomprehensible. This the Saviour also rejected. Then the tempter offered the last and strongest inducement, promising to give Him all the kingdoms of the world and their glory (Matt. 2:4–8), but the offer was not accepted. The new kingdom of Christ was strong, not because of its many kingdoms, numerous populations, many great cities; it was to be strong because of a very different power until then almost unknown to the world. Its might was to be the might of the spirit, of conviction, of inner faith. This is why this kingdom was to live on in the midst of collapsing empires. It had been supported and guarded, not by spears and arrows and the garments of war, but by people

clad in rags not knowing where to lay their heads. In the new Kingdom of Christ men were needed, free of spirit, attached to Christ the Saviour even unto prison and death. Men were needed who in the midst of purely earthly conditions lived according to the law of a different kingdom, of a kingdom not of this world; people able to wear rags as if they were the most precious garments; able to die on burning pyres in circuses, in the midst of torture, glad in spirit, claiming that in the midst of consuming flames they felt as if floating in soothing waters; people able to talk very differently from the people in similar conditions in the past. People who could say: "We are troubled on every side, yet not distressed; we are perplexed but not in despair; persecuted, but not forsaken; cast down, but not destroyed" (II Cor. 4:8–9); they think of us "as dying, and behold we live; as chastened, and not killed; as sorrowful, yet always rejoicing; as poor, yet making many rich; as having nothing, and yet possessing all things" (II Cor. 6: 9–10); "for we which live are always delivered unto death for Jesus' sake, that the life also of Jesus might be made manifest in our body. . . . For which cause we faint not" (II Cor. 4:11 and 16). For in the new free kingdom of Christ people are not needed whose faith and whose affections are outside them; people are not needed whose submission was secured by gifts of bread, by miracles, or kingly dominion, for the servants of Christ often have to go without bread, unsupported by any miracle, unsupplied with any authority. Then, how and by what shall they live?

I cannot keep your attention any longer on the remarkable decisive moment in the service of Christ the Saviour, which sharply separates the new current introduced into the ancient world as the only escape into the path of truth, out of the vast labyrinth of human wanderings. The theme of this new departure is well developed in Russian literature. Enough to remember *The Great Inquisitor* of the ever-to-be-remembered Feodor Dostoevsky. Our

own life's experience can teach us still more about this moment. For in reality all our life in its every moment is neither more nor less than our following either Christ or the Tempter.

The people, struck by the great miracle of feeding five thousand with only five loaves of bread and two fishes, were transported with delight. They said: "This is of a truth that Prophet that should come into the world" (John 6:14). Under the mighty influence of this belief the people wanted to seize the Saviour by force, bringing Him into the Holy City and proclaiming Him their King. It would have been so simple and so easy at this moment, but the Saviour did not comply with the eager wishes of the people, though He knew their source was pure. "When Jesus therefore perceived that they would come and take him by force, to make him a king, he departed again into a mountain himself alone" (John 6:15). His own brothers also counselled Him to become the Master of their people. "Now the Jews' feast of tabernacles was at hand. His brethren therefore said unto him, Depart hence, and go into Judea, that thy disciples also may see the works that thou doest. For there is no man that doeth any thing in secret, and he himself seeketh to be known openly. If thou do these things, shew thyself to the world" (John 7:2–4). But the kindly wishes of the brothers were answered as follows: "Go ye up unto this feast: I go not up unto this feast: for my time is not yet full come. When he had said these words unto them, he abode still in Galilee" (John 6:8–9).

In forbidding His disciples to take revenge on the people of Samaria who refused them shelter, in refusing to condemn the man who exorcised demons though never following Christ, the Saviour rejected the worldly methods of dealing with people. When in the Garden of Gethsemane the Saviour was surrounded by the soldiers intending to deliver Him into the hands of the high priests, the most impulsive of His disciples used the sword in His

defence, the Saviour did not approve his act, though well He knew it was kindly and sincerely meant. He turned to this disciple and said: "Put up thy sword again into its place: for all they that take the sword shall perish with the sword. Thinkest thou that I cannot now pray to my Father, and he shall presently give me more than twelve legions of angels?" (St. Matt. 26:52–53). For the Son of Man needed no such means to spread His Kingdom to the ends of the earth.

Even before this the disciples of the Lord offered the use of swords as a means of defending Him. "And they said, Lord, behold, here are two swords. And he said unto them, It is enough. And he came out and went, as he was wont, to the Mount of Olives" (St. Luke 22: 38–39). In this case the Saviour did not even attempt to explain to them how profoundly in error they were, in intending to use the sword as a means for defending truth and inner liberty. The sadly spoken "Enough" was His only answer.

"Tell ye the daughter of Sion, Behold thy King cometh unto thee, meek, and sitting upon an ass, and a colt the foal of an ass" (St. Matt. 21:5). In these words is offered to us the briefest characterization of all the earthly life and activity of Christ, which, for all its brevity, clearly and precisely describes the new spiritual Kingdom He was building, and the future of this Kingdom. As it were, this is a programme written with letters of fire. Great masses of people assembled around the Saviour. The enthusiasm penetrating the hearts of the people swept them all like a flame fed with abundant fuel which struck an abundant combustible material. As one man the people rejoiced, forgetting the differences of position, age and wealth. "And the multitudes that went before, and that followed, cried, saying, Hosanna to the Son of David: Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord; Hosanna in the highest" (St. Matt. 21:9).

When the Saviour, on all sides pressed by rejoicing

masses, entered Jerusalem, "all the city was moved, saying, Who is this?" (St. Matt. 21:10). "And when the chief priests and scribes saw the wonderful things that he did, and the children crying in the temple, and saying, Hosanna to the Son of David; they were sore displeased. And said unto them, Hearest thou what these say? And Jesus saith unto them, Yea; have ye never read, Out of the mouths of babes and sucklings thou hast perfected praise?" (St. Matt. 21:15–16).

How easy at this time it would have been to take the kingly power into His hands. Yet what did the King of the new coming Kingdom of the Spirit? "Behold thy king cometh unto thee, meek" (St. Matt. 21:5). Quiet and gentle is His gaze. He comes armed with weapons compared to which swords and javelins are as nothing. Indeed He comes to conquer the people, to conquer them so completely that in His Name they will go into the fire, in prison, into the arenas to be torn by wild beasts. "Who shall separate us from the love of Christ? shall tribulation, or distress, or persecution, or famine, or nakedness, or peril, or sword?" (Rom. 8:35). Said one of His disciples some ten years after His death, "For I am persuaded that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature, shall be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord" (Rom. 8:38–39).

Thus we see that in establishing the new most holy and most blissful Kingdom on earth, the Saviour rejected all the means that were offered to Him to ensure the speedier spread of His influence. He built up His new Kingdom by the Word alone. The Word served Him in the stead of sword, fire, battle-chariot, weapons, and violence; in fact, all that in the world of sin is used by men in desperate struggles against one another.

Throughout all His public life the Saviour constantly went from one town to another, walking to spread His

Word of good tidings from one end of Judea, Samaria and Galilee to the other. He never had any constant and definite dwelling-place. Here is the statement of the Son of Man as to this: "And Jesus saith unto him, The foxes have holes, and the birds of the air have nests; but the Son of Man hath not where to lay His head" (St. Matt. 8:20). When He taught in the Sanhedrin of Capernaum, and the people tried to detain Him, loath to part with Him, the Saviour said unto them, "I must preach the kingdom of God to other cities also; for therefore am I sent" (St. Luke 4:43). When His disciples said, Everybody is seeking thee, He answered: "Let us go into the next towns, that I may preach there also; for therefore came I forth" (St. Mark 1:38).

During His life on earth Christ did work great miracles, but they are submerged and lost in the wonderful sea of His teaching. Moreover, what were they, if not that same teaching manifested in life in a more visible way in confirmation of the Word? The very sacrifice of Golgotha also is an eternal, eloquent, most vital sermon preached without words for they all have been said before.

When Pilate sat in judgment over Christ, few words were exchanged between them. Answering Pilate, Christ said: "To this end was I born, and for this cause came I into the world, that I should bear witness unto the truth. Every one that is of the truth heareth my voice" (St. John 18:37). He stated for us also the true reason of His coming. And it is evident that though accepting the words of the Christ, His reference to truth being the object of His preaching, Pilate made the mistake of considering Christ as one of the many teachers and philosophers who walked through many countries attempting to solve monotonous and dull questions concerning truth, sunk in the abyss of mutual disagreements and contradictions. The great inner power of Christ's preaching was demonstrated in the most striking, self-evident way in the parables of the mustard seed, the leaven, the pearl,

and the hidden treasure. Interpreting these parables, St. John Chrysostom says, "These are the parables that prove that preaching as an instrument should be preferred to anything else." And indeed, does not the history of centuries of Christianity brilliantly demonstrate the truth of it, which we behold with our own eyes.

Sending His disciples out to preach, Christ commanded them to baptize people, first having taught them (St. Matt. 28:19). Christ taught that one has first to believe to be baptized, and, in the words of the apostle, faith comes from hearing. Who could teach the believers without preaching? However exalted the thought of man, still there are heights above which it cannot rise. Yet there are certain demands in the soul of man, certain unsolved questions, which need greater heights than those our thought can reach. The summit of our life is lost beyond the clouds of heavenly life and grace, and there, on the highest points accessible to mortals, we can receive sustenance only in a mysterious way from the sacraments. This is why sacraments lose all significance for the man who has lost faith. Once a man has fallen out of the sphere of a certain world-concept, both the sublimity of Christianity and of life in Christ lose their significance.

The Word was left as the only instrument for the struggle with the world. Enjoining His disciples before leaving this earth to teach the mysteries of the Kingdom of God, Christ said: "Ye shall bear witness unto me both in Jerusalem, and in all Judea, and in Samaria, and unto the uttermost part of the earth" (Acts 1:8). Warning His disciples of the coming temptations and tribulations, Christ said ominously: "And when they bring you unto the synagogues, and unto magistrates, and powers, take ye no thought how or what thing ye shall answer, or what ye shall say: For the Holy Ghost shall teach you in the same hour what ye ought to say" (St. Luke 12:11–12). Here we hear once more the direct statement of the Master that the Word possesses an all-conquering power, coming

direct from heaven, and above any power of human making.

The fourth century A. D. was the Golden Age of Christian literature. At that time the most popular science studied in the schools was rhetoric. The art of eloquence was studied by all; members of the imperial household, nay, emperors themselves, followed the example of Constantine the Great in applying themselves most assiduously to the study of rhetoric. Orators were held in great honour. Thousands of people came from near and far to hear a man speak if he was known as a great orator. In the second century the school of Athens was renowned for its teachers of philosophy, of politics and of rhetoric. But the first two began soon to be crowded out by the latter. In the third century the chair of politics was entirely engulfed by the chair of rhetoric. The chair of philosophy held out a little longer, but in the middle of the fourth century no celebrated professors of the school of philosophy were mentioned in the annals of Athens. Philosophy as a science was engulfed in its turn. Rhetoric became a universal science. Great masters, the pride and glory of Athens, taught eloquence, attracting pupils from all the countries. Among these pupils there were Arabs, Armenians, Syrians, Byzantines, Romans, Gauls, Egyptians, Africans. All were drawn to Athens by the professors of rhetoric, whom St. Gregory the Divine called the "universal Fathers of Eloquence".

There are many interesting things to be said about the organization of the school and the young men trained in it. For lack of space we cannot go into it, making an exception, however, for the famous Proæresius. Proæresius was a native of Cappadocia. He was the only Christian among all the rhetoricians of the Athenian school; this did not prevent him from being foremost in an establishment heathen in origin and faculty. Many a time Proæresius had to speak unexpectedly to audiences strange and even antagonistic, but, though his opponents

were well prepared, he always came out victorious. Whether he spoke in theatres or school auditoriums, the enthusiasm of his audiences was past description. At times even his enemies, jealous of him and opposing him, were carried away by his irresistible eloquence. Having heard wonderful accounts of him, Emperor Constantius wanted to hear him so much that he invited him to come to Gaul. Everywhere on his way Proæresius made a triumphant impression. Constantius also was so impressed that the "divine" orator received from him every honour and many rewards. He was asked to the imperial table with the greatest magnates of the empire; as a mark of esteem for Proæresius the Emperor ordered the revenues of several rather important islands to be turned over to Athens. Moreover, the rhetorician was promoted by imperial order to the grade of *stratopedarch*, which in modern nomenclature corresponds to the grade of a chief commander of armies. At the wish of the Emperor, the orator, on leaving Gaul, went to Rome where he was so greatly admired that a full-sized statue was raised to him, the inscription on which was: "The King of Cities to the King of Eloquence." Later on, a similar statue was raised in Athens.

It is most noteworthy that with years his wonderful gift never diminished, but on the contrary reached new degrees of development and force. Proæresius was seventy-eight when St. Basil the Great and St. Gregory the Divine became his pupils in the school of Athens; also a nephew of the Emperor, Julian, who later was called the Apostate. On becoming Emperor, a good many years later, Julian forbade Christians to teach or to be taught the oratory of the heathens, but Proæresius was excepted, so great was the regard and gratitude of the apostate Emperor for his old teacher.

Were we to quote the Fathers and teachers of the Church we could produce an enormous and magnificent anthology in support of "the Word", to which it would

hardly be necessary to add anything of our own, in spite of the additional experience of fifteen centuries accumulated since. We shall quote a few lines from the writings of two of the great Fathers of the Church.

In one of his Homilies, St. Gregory the Divine thus addresses his listeners:

"I bring to the present time and to you, and, still more, to God, the Word, the most befitting offering of thanks, a gift purer than gold and more precious than the most precious of stones. . . . I offer and consecrate that to God which alone I have retained with me, which alone is my wealth. Everything else I have renounced in obedience to the commandment and the Spirit; all that was mine I exchanged for the most precious pearl and so have become (or better to say, wish to become) like unto the fortunate merchant who exchanged the lesser, the doubtlessly perishable for that which is greatest of all, which is certainly incorruptible (St. Matt. 13:45–46). I retain for myself the Word alone. . . ."

Further on, speaking of Basil the Great, Gregory the Divine says that he imitated

"in eloquence the Sons of Zebedee. . . . For this not only was he entrusted with the keys of heaven all the way from Jerusalem to Illiricum, but he has also encompassed a much wider circle by the Gospels. And though he was not given the name, yet he has become a Son of Thunder. He also, laying his head on the Master's breast, derived from it the power of the Word and the depth of the thought".

St. John Chrysostom also prized the Word very highly. In one of his Homilies, he says:

"I have not steel, but have the Word, which is sharper than steel: I carry no fire, but I have a teaching whose flames are more than the fire and more able to burn."

In another Homily, the Father of the golden speech says:

"Baptism, I repeat once more, is a most important matter, for without baptism we have no access to the Kingdom of Heaven, but it can be performed by a man of no great importance. Preaching, however, demands great labour. . . . Paul did not seem to obtain honour from the people by administering baptism. . . . More than this, he says: 'Christ sent me not to baptize but to preach the Gospel' (I Cor. 1:17). The latter is much more difficult. It demanded greater effort and an especial moral fortitude. He was sent to do a greater work. Anyone could baptize who had been ordained, but preaching was given to but a few."

This is why

"this work is entrusted to the simpler presbyters, and the administration of doctrine to the wisest. . . . This is why he says himself: 'Let the elders that rule well be counted worthy of double honour, especially they who labour in the word and doctrine'" (I Tim. 5:17).

Further, St. John Chrysostom says:

"If twelve men unused to warfare, not only weaponless but weak in body, entering into a struggle with a great detachment of armed warriors, suffered no harm . . . but killed some and made prisoners of others, never being wounded themselves, would you say that this is the work of men? But the victory of the Apostles is ever so much more wonderful. It is not so wonderful if a naked man remain immune from wounds, as if an unlearned, humble fisherman conquer the strong, . . . in spite of danger, of deeply rooted habit, of the severity of the rule he offers, of the daily threatening death, the many who are tempted away and the worldly might of the tempters."

And so we see that in the age of the Holy Fathers the great idea of the all-creating Word not only was not dead, but was thus luminously defined.

Coming to the Middle Ages, we behold another interesting period. The power of the inspired Word of Bernard of Clairvaux is known. His fiery eloquence prevented schism, established peace between the princes and the pope, reformed morality, closed the lips of heretics, lit up in countless hearts an ardent love of God and called all Europe to the Cross.

The Word of Francis of Assisi was like a flaming brand, penetrating into the most secret recesses of human hearts, filling all with admiration and changing the surrounding life beyond recognition.

Vincent of Ferrara attracted many thousands of listeners at a time. His sermons brought repentance to more than one hundred thousand sinners, and twenty-five thousand Jews and eight thousand Saracens were converted. At that period arose the Order of the Dominicans, whose chief duty is preaching, their name being *fratres prædicatores*. These brother preachers had the right of preaching everywhere outside their monastery without first seeking the permission of the parish clergy or even of the bishops. Dominican travelling preachers

were to be met with everywhere in Western Europe. They preached repentance, helped the spread of the Catholic faith and founded all kinds of charities.

The crusades were an interesting example of the power of preaching. The Word inspired Europe with the desire to tear the Holy Sepulchre from the infidels, and brought into moral union nations which were far removed from each other, owing partly to geographical distances and partly to inner enmity and strife. Dying on battlefields, the crusaders heard words of consolation, cheer and confidence from their pastors. The power of preaching was incalculable. Think of these hordes of nations moving towards the Lord's Sepulchre, unmurmuringly suffering great pains; different nations blending into one family, the whole of Europe set into commotion and aglow with enthusiasm.

I am nearing our own days. I heard a Russian poet say:

"The Word is the most powerful of weapons and a writer is the greatest warrior in the struggle for enlightenment. I am glad I am an author."

This is profoundly true. A picture creates an impression, music creates a mood. The Word creates an impression and a mood, gives new emotions, explains and develops life. Pictures illustrate thoughts; so does music, so does sculpture, so does everything visible. An author must awaken our thought and give it direction; then painting will be able to confirm and strengthen it.

Professor James said:

"The prophet drinks a deeper cup of the bitterness of life than anyone else; but his conduct is so undeviating and his speech so powerful in inspiring alertness, that his will becomes ours, and our life is lighted at his."

Here are a few beautiful lines by I. S. Aksakoff:

"We Christians speak even of God as the Word. Violation of the freedom of the Word is not only sacrilege, it is an attempt to harm the divine side of man, to harm that which makes man a man. The destruction of the life of the Word is the most awful of homicides."

Another author writes:

"Take the dogs away from any sheepfold and, in spite of all the care and watchfulness of the shepherd, the wolf is sure to sneak in in the dark, chasing and devouring the sheep. Take the teachers and preachers away from any church, city or province, and, in spite of all the holiness and righteousness of the pastor, hearing no preached Word, Satan will enter to steal and destroy."

Father John of Cronstadt writes:

"What is the relation between the word and the act? The Word of God called from non-being both the visible and the invisible worlds. Word was deed in the mouth of God. Therefore word and deed should be inseparable, as the soul and the body, during life. He who keeps and does the commandments of Christ faithfully and constantly, with whom word is deed, is well able even *at this moment* to do great and wonderful things, for everything obeys His word: demons submit, ills are healed, and human morals built up."

"If we, the pastors of the Church, are silent, we do not deserve the name of pastors", said St. Tikhon. "What is silent pastorship?" repeats the recluse Bishop. But the Bishop of Volhynia adds:

"Unfortunately the living Word was never sufficiently appreciated in the Russian Church; it is exactly the clergy who failed to appreciate it. . . . Yet it is the greatest power of pastorship, the power of the Church."

A few lines from Henry Ward Beecher are still more remarkable:

"If a printed book, even supposing it contained the teaching of Jesus Christ, could be sufficient for the feeding of the energy and the constant saturation of the will of man by the elements of divine truth, the most adequate thing to do would be to hang to the ceiling of the church a Gospel Book of great dimensions and to hire a servant who would turn the pages of this book for the readers."

Our ecclesiastical schools are the servants of the Word, from the coarsest of its materialistic interpretations to the most mystical. Fortunately every chair of the Academy brings to the people some aspect of the same eternal Logos. The authoritative Word of our Academy is heard all over Russia. Not only is it heard and spread, but it is also able to call forth new life.

MYSTERY AND MIGHT OF THE WORD

The all-conquering, the all-powerful virtue of the Word that is from heaven has preserved Christianity to this day in the midst of all trials and tribulations. History shows that the power of preaching is to this day stronger than any other power on the face of the earth, from the sword and the blood to the most refined wisdom of man. Each of us, as a Christian, has experienced in his own life how authoritative and irresistible is the working of the Word.

Catholicity

By Herbert Symonds,
Christ Church Cathedral, Montreal

It is not possible to write on the subject of Catholicity without approaching it from some particular point of view. It will therefore make for clearness if, at the outset, it is stated that the position herein adopted may be described as evolutionary—by which it is meant that whilst the *idea* of Catholicity is contained in the New Testament, its perfect *embodiment* is found neither there nor at any particular point of time in the history of the Church. This is a different point of view from that of any body of Christians, who believe that a stereotyped form of doctrine, organization or worship is to be found in the past. The Holy Catholic Church is not, nor has ever been, a completely realized or perfected society. As the City of God or as the Temple of Humanity, it is in course of construction; as the Body of Christ it is growing; as the Family of God it seeks but has not yet fully achieved the harmony of perfect relations; as the Universal Society it is still far short of including all the world. Both extensively and intensively, the Catholic Church is an ideal in course of realization.

But further it must be premised that this limitation is not solely a limitation of incompletion. It includes also the limitations of error, and error in this connection is threefold. The error of false doctrine; the error of moral failure; and the error that springs out of failure to rank in their due order things that may be true and good. To illustrate these points from the figure of a Temple, we may say that the idea of the Catholic Church

is like the architect's plan, and the realization of it like the growing building, only the builders do not follow accurately the plan, nor observe its true proportions. Now and again, parts have to be taken down and reconstructed. Moreover, the builders are not always working together. Yet in spite of these obvious sources of delay and mistake the building grows and faith can see it though lying far in the future, a glorious Temple at last completed, a realized ideal.

But even the various forms of error do not exhaust the sources of change. History teaches us that the Christian idea in shaping itself among different peoples and at different times adapts itself, to some extent at least, in forms of government, forms of worship, forms of doctrine, to the conditions of time and place. But as circumstances change so do customs and forms. The stately pine of our American forests as it rears itself upwards towards the heavens, sheds off its lower branches from time to time. So in the Church as it presses onwards and upwards, many customs, rites and ceremonies may be shed off. They have done their work. Nor is it one church only that is thus affected but all of them, some more, some less.

I.

The words Catholic and Catholicity bear among us a variety of meanings. They are great and glorious words but in some quarters they have fallen into disrepute. Sometimes they are used as a kind of label for external things of quite secondary importance, and those who observe them are "Catholics" and those who do not, although in full communion, are not. Thus the limit of paradox is reached when the word becomes the badge of a party.

Theoretically, the word Catholic ought, one would suppose, to be synonymous with Christian. Strictly speaking,

it has never been so. From the very first there have been those entitled to the name of Christian who have been outside the organized church, or have belonged to a denomination. And for a thousand years there have been divisions amongst those who, an impartial observer must believe, have equal right to the name of both Christian and Catholic. This fact illustrates the truth of the contention that the Catholic Church is a growing and not a completed body, an idea in course of realization. It is often claimed that Christians at all events agree on the Apostles' Creed. But the claim is delusive. We may all agree to use the form of words of the Creed, but we profoundly differ in their interpretation. "I believe in the Holy Catholic Church," we all say, but how many different things we mean by those words!

When these facts are considered, we see how extraordinarily difficult it becomes to define the word Catholic, or to say precisely what is and what is not Catholicity. And yet some attempt at, not definition, but description must be made.

It will perhaps help matters to distinguish. The word Catholic is applied to some things which are outward as, for example, Catholic Ritual, Catholic Ministry, and so on. And it is applied to things that are inward, that is to ideas. In this article, I limit myself to the ideas of Catholicity because the externals of Catholicity must depend upon the ideas. No custom or rite which limits the idea of Catholicity ought to be regarded as Catholic. To describe fasting communion as Catholic and to refuse the title of Catholic to those who do not observe this custom is an undue restriction of the term and unduly limits Catholicity itself.

The root idea of Catholicity is universality. The necessary quality of Catholicity is that it shall be capable of becoming universal. It is for all the world. It is something that can at once transcend and include all national and racial distinctions. Catholicity does not

involve the destruction or the passing away of nations or of national distinctions; it aims at including them and linking them together in the bonds of a true relationship. Catholicity is not cosmopolitanism though it possesses the cosmopolitan spirit. When Oliver Goldsmith wrote the following words he was giving precise expression to the true idea of Universality, that is, so far as it goes, to Catholicity: "Among all the famous sayings of antiquity, there is none that does greater honour to the author, or affords greater pleasure to the reader . . . than that of the philosopher, who being asked what countryman he was, replied that he was a citizen of the world. How few are there to be found in modern times who can say the same, or whose conduct is consistent with such a profession! We are now become so much . . . the natives of one particular spot, or members of one petty society, that we no longer consider ourselves as the general inhabitants of the globe, or members of that grand society which comprehends the whole human kind."

But though universality is the fundamental notion embedded in the word Catholic, it conveys no precise meaning to the mind by itself. What is it that is universal? What is the idea that universal Christianity contains and then sows like seed throughout the world for the world's good?

This is not an easy question to answer. Any one who has ever attempted to define Christianity knows how difficult a task it is. And this because Christianity is not merely a system of thought or doctrine, not merely a form of worship or of government, but a Life and the Life Eternal. Christianity is not even a religion in the ordinary sense of the word, but rather as Jowett said "the crown and flower of them all." In his excellent lectures on *Catholicity*, Mr. Lacey refuses to attempt any cut and dried definition "by which you may determine whether this or that doctrine is rightly to be called Cath-

olic. There is no such thing," he says. "The Church is Catholic precisely because it is too large for that sort of particularity. If you attempt this kind of definition you will find that you have merely defined a sect."

Whilst there are many things in the world that we cannot define, we can usually describe them. We can often see how they came to be, and what they are. This is what is styled the genetic account of objects. We may attempt then to discover Catholicity genetically.

We leave then for the time being the Christian communions of to-day and ascend the great stream of Christian history until we reach its source, the New Testament. And even then we find that this source is itself the end of a previous development, which we call the Old Testament.

For our purposes in the present article we need say but a word on the Old Testament. One fundamental difference between the Old and the New Testament is that the Old Testament contains the religion of a nation, and the New Testament the religion of the world. Thus we come at once to our first mark of Catholicity, its universality.

But now how did this matter present itself to those first founders of the Church who crossed the "great divide" between nationalism and Catholicity? What was in their minds as nationalists in religion that passed away, and what was that new thing that took its place or that grew out of it? The answer is neither difficult nor doubtful. Consider the story of St. Peter and Cornelius in the tenth chapter of the Acts of the Apostles. It begins with the perplexing vision of the sheet let down from heaven containing clean and unclean animals and a command, most abhorrent to Peter, indiscriminately to eat of them. But when the Apostle meets the Company assembled in Cornelius' house, the meaning of the vision flashed upon his mind. To them he addresses words of most radical import. "You are doubtless aware

that it is forbidden for a Jew to be intimate with a foreigner or even to enter his house; and yet God has shewn me that I ought not to call any man defiled or unclean." And a little later, "I see, beyond all doubt, that God does not shew partiality, but that in every nation he who reverences him and does what is right is acceptable to him."

St. Peter now sees something that he had never seen before. His religion had been national and exclusive. His refusal to have anything to do with Gentiles had been based upon earnest and sincere religion. Now he saw that this was all wrong. "In every nation" men are acceptable to God. There is the expression of universality.

St. Paul passes through the same experience. He too had been a Pharisee of the Pharisees. But, being a man of greater intellectual power than St. Peter, he gave a far more forcible and theological expression to the new truth of universality. He relates this doctrine far more clearly than did St. Peter to the work of Christ. Peter still remains the Apostle of the Circumcision, Paul is the Apostle of the Gentiles. Not only does he repeatedly assert that "in Christ Jesus there is neither Jew nor Gentile, barbarian or Scythian, bond or free", but he sets forth the mission of the Church to be the realization of this truth of universality. Baptism is the initiation into this universal society. "In one spirit are we all baptized into one body," the Holy Communion its feast of fellowship. "We being many are one bread."

The truth has become a commonplace of the pulpit and yet we are far from realizing how fundamental it is. We need to use our imaginations and force ourselves to think as a Peter and a Paul thought when they were Jews in spirit, and then how they felt when first the truth of Catholicity burst upon their minds. It was, we no doubt can see, an evolution, but to them it was a revolution. The Fatherhood of God and the Brother-

hood of Man, revealed in Jesus Christ, and made effective through the Holy Spirit in the Church, this is Catholicity in its most general terms. Mr. Lacey sums up the matter in similar but not identical terms. He finds four primary elements in Catholicity. "Catholicity means that the Christian religion embraces ideally and potentially all mankind; it means that no rival or supplementary cult is to be endured; it means the transcendance not only of civic or national bounds, but of the whole world; it means the proclamation of one transcendent God."

But whichever way we put it, it is worth while noticing that so far neither Roman nor Greek, neither modernist nor traditionalist, neither Evangelical nor High Churchman need have any quarrel in respect of the primary elements of Catholicity.

II.

It is when one descends from the primary to what may be called the secondary elements of Catholicity that controversy and divisions arise. In briefly tracing out the causes of these divisions let me begin by pointing out my conclusion, which is twofold. First, that in the course of theological and ecclesiastical development, many things that are secondary came gradually to usurp the place of things that are primary, so that the power of Catholicity was broken, and the very spirit of Catholicity was so seriously adulterated that not only is fellowship destroyed, but Christianity itself appears in different countries in the form of independent national religions. Secondly, that without condemning our forefathers, we may say that the development of our religious apprehension renders it no longer necessary that men should be absolutely sundered by divergencies of doctrine where the genuine spirit of Catholicity is displayed; in other words, that spiritual, not dogmatic, tests should

be ultimate. This is not intended as an assault upon doctrine but as an attempt to relegate it to what one ventures to regard as its true place in the development of Christianity.

The student of history knows that the forms of Christianity have ever been modified by its environment. Christianity begins as an outgrowth of Judaism and its first expressions are Judaistic. The leading words are Messiah, Son of Man, Kingdom of heaven. But when it is transferred from the soil of Judaism to that of Greek thought and civilization these terms fall into the background and new terms denoting quite distinct ideas come into use, such as Logos, Church, Mysteries. The first Christian apologetic seeks to prove that Jesus is the Messiah of Hebrew prophecy, the second seeks to prove that Jesus is the Logos of Hellenistic thought.

The identification of the Logos with Jesus opens out a vast field of enquiry partly theological and partly philosophical. The acute and enquiring mind of the Greek is absorbed in theology. Gradually, little by little, every possible form of belief about the person of Jesus is put forward, examined, discussed and finally accepted or rejected. At last the great Nicene-Constantinopolitan Creed, and the Chalcedonian formula are endorsed and the Church has what is called a Catholic Creed. How well and thoroughly this work of formulating Christian theology was done is seen by comparing the history of the Nicene Creed with that of the comparatively recent Confessions of the Reformation period.

This Hellenizing of Christianity was a necessary process. Only so could Christianity conquer the Greek world. Yet it was not all gain. When after following the intricacies and complexities of this long course of theological development, we turn back to the gospel narrative of the teaching of Jesus, we cannot fail to observe the vast difference in method, point of view and result. The Catholic Creed of Nicea, Constantinople and Chalcedon

is the result of a prolonged almost interminable discussion of questions concerning which Our Lord said but little, and entirely omits a large field of life concerning which Our Lord said much. Compare Our Lord's method of teaching about God with that of Greek theologians. Compare Our Lord's revelation of the principle of divine judgment in the parable of the sheep and the goats with the principle which was the inevitable result of the Greek period, that *before all things* it is necessary to hold the Catholic faith, and it is almost impossible to exaggerate the contrast. The notion of orthodoxy was quite foreign to Our Lord's teaching, just as it is to Judaism, but it is the dominant note of Greek Christianity and is still with the vast majority of Christians.

The criticism we have to pass upon this process of Greek thought is not that it was a misfortune, or, what I think Harnack somewhe recalls it, a "pathological process". On the contrary, it was inevitable, and it was magnificent, nor *per se* are its conclusions to be regarded as contradicting the Gospel. But when it is set forth not simply as a guide to Christian doctrine but as the ultimate test of a Christian man, then we feel that it has moved far away from the methods and tests of Christ Himself, and something secondary has been exalted to a primary position. Tested thus, a Rodrigo Borgia is a Christian, he satisfies the primary test of orthodoxy; but William Ellery Channing is not!

It is not difficult to show that by a similar process of modification produced by the influences of environment the Catholic Church, including the Catholic doctrine of the Episcopate, and even Catholic worship, were evolved. One example of the influence of environment upon both the ideas and the form of worship may be cited from Allen's *Christian Institutions*. In the Greek Church of the fifth century, the ceremonial motive of the ritual of the Eucharist, "was the adaptation or reproduction of the court etiquette of an oriental monarch, as the standard

for symbolizing or dramatizing the soul's approach to God". Dr. Allen illustrates this statement by the following illuminating passage from Gregory of Nyssa's treatise on the Holy Spirit: "Inasmuch as men when approaching emperors and potentates for the objects which they wish in some way to obtain from those rulers, do not bring to them their mere petition only, but employ every possible means to induce them to feel pity and favour towards themselves, clasping their knees, prostrating themselves on the ground, and putting forward to plead for their petition all sorts of pathetic signs to wake that pity, so it is that those who recognize the true Potentate, by whom all things in existence are controlled, when they are supplicating for that which they have at heart . . . carry the ceremonial used in the case of men into the service of the Deity. And this is what worship is, that worship, I mean, which is offered for the objects we have at heart along with supplication and humiliation." Contrast this philosophy of prayer which was shaped in conformity with the current ideas of Gregory's days with Our Lord's words, "When ye pray say, Our Father."

A similar conclusion follows from a bird's-eye view of the Middle Ages. Historical science has long since exploded the old Protestant view of this period. In its reaction against the wholesale condemnation of a thousand years as the "Dark Ages", the Romantic movement went too far, but we are able now with a large measure of impartiality fairly to estimate its greatness and its limitations. The Catholic Church boldly and faithfully grappled with the vast problem that confronted it, but who can deny that the form which it assumed during this period was conditioned by the circumstances in which it found itself. The great note of absolute authority would never have been sounded had not the mission of the Church to the western barbarians been that of the schoolmaster. Had there been no Roman Emperor would there ever have been a Roman Pope? Just as soon

as the Papacy announces itself as a necessary part of the Church's structure it ceases to be Catholic. Absolute authority may be necessary during one stage in the development of the Church, but it is not an essential note of the Gospel and is not therefore a Catholic idea.

Whilst the genuinely historical way of interpreting the Reformation is to see in it a true development, it must be affirmed of it equally with previous periods that no finality can be attached to it. Circumstances gave this part of the church, too, its peculiar shape. It was a disruptive movement, but it is hard to see how it could have been anything else. Its doctrine of the verbal infallibility of the Bible will not stand the test of criticism, and its quite natural assumptions that the New Testament must contain all the *externalia* of the Church, forms of government and of worship, are now seen to be unwarranted. We are no longer living in the Reformation period. Modern thought and modern science, however much many may dislike and fear them, are proceeding on quite other lines. Our interpretation of history, though less obviously, is no less really transformed by the notion of evolution, than is our interpretation of the physical world. Even where it is least suspected the movement towards unity, to-day so general, has its ground in this fact.

The survey of the history of Christianity issues in the conclusion that Catholicity is fundamentally an idea, an idea which is only progressively realized in the Church, and which is realized "in many ways" and in different ways at different times.

> "God fulfils Himself in many ways
> Lest one good custom should corrupt the world."

Human society in all its activities develops itself through the interaction of the conservative and radical forces. The religious life of mankind is not exempt from this rule. The Catholic idea may to-day be a conservative,

and to-morrow a radical force, but it is, we repeat, one which has no golden age in the past.

III.

Christendom has now for so many centuries been accustomed to regard its foundation as a dogmatic creed, and to define Christianity from the dogmatic point of view, that it requires a strong effort of mind, even after we are seized of the considerations advanced above, to get away from this idea. Yet it would have been perfectly easy for Our Lord to have given a Creed had He desired to do so. But Catholicity was not an idea indissolubly bound up with either Creed, Government or Worship. Even in respect of so brief and inarticulated a statement as the Baptismal formula, "The name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost," the balance of probability favours those who regard it as a development of an earlier form. In the Acts of the Apostles, the form is baptism in the name of Jesus (See Acts II, 38; viii, 16; xix, 5. Cp. also Romans VI, 3; Gal. III, 27). It is at this point that the "Conference on Faith and Order", if I may venture to say so, is in danger of going wrong. It is certainly a laudable effort to discover how far there may be agreement between the churches represented in the Conference and how far and wherein they differ. But if this enquiry be conducted with a view to the formulation of a credal basis of union it is doomed, and rightly doomed to disappointment. We do not want a Catholic Church which is not wide enough to include all who "profess and call themselves Christians", and the credal basis implies the old view, in the light of the doctrine of development now seen to be erroneous, that a final and complete and unchangeable creed can be composed for a growing and developing Church. The statement of conclusions reached by a Committee of the Conference in England already

illustrates this danger. We are told of a large number of propositions in which all the signatories, representing I think ten denominations, agreed. But whilst they may agree on the propositions, do they agree, or do the churches they represent agree in their interpretations of those propositions? For example, the document in question implies that agreement was reached about the doctrines concerning creation, sin, the Church, the last things. But how wide a gulf separates the believer in the literal interpretation of Genesis I, from the thoroughgoing evolutionist. Still more profound are the differences in the definition or description of Sin given by different churches or different parties within the churches. Of course if the statement simply means that there is flowing from "this doctrine of God", a sequence of doctrines concerning creation, human nature and destiny, sin, individual and racial, redemption . . . the Church, the last things, and that each one is at liberty to interpret them as he pleases, our criticism falls to the ground. But this is by no means agreement. We find again a statement of agreement to accept the Apostles' and Nicene Creed. But do two or more people really accept statements as to the interpretation of which they profoundly differ? Dr. Shakespeare and Bishop Gore both say "I believe in one Catholic and Apostolic Church", but Dr. Gore differs so vitally from Dr. Shakespeare as to what is meant by the phrase that he would regard it as sacrilege to kneel side by side with him at the Lord's Table, and a grave breach of order to allow him to preach in an English Church. Is it not a kind of elaborate "make believe", to call this sort of thing agreement, and does it not reveal the truth that for free and intelligent Christians a credal basis of unity is an impossibility.

I cannot rid myself of the feeling that the sense of the need of a credal basis of unity springs from a certain lack of faith, issuing in fear. We are afraid lest if men be not

bound hand and foot by some form of words put forth by some authority, the faith will be destroyed. Such a fear in our time seems to me to witness to a want of living faith not only in the power of truth, but in the actual operation of the Holy Spirit. My objection, however, is not to doctrines *per se*, but only to the making of them the final test and measure of a Christian, because this kind of test is not of Christ.

The task that is set before our divided Christendom is not an easy one, nor is it one that can be accomplished in a day. The plea that is made in this paper is for a determined effort to set forth impartially the essential ideas that are the content of the word Catholicity, and to test every part of our inherited Christianity, whether we seek its principles and forms in the fourth century, or in the middle ages or in the reformation period, by the result. But the principle of historical evolution forbids us to believe that such a process of testing will lead to anything that is radical or revolutionary in result. To abandon creeds as final tests of Christianity is not a revolutionary proposition, because it is not proposed to abandon the Creed itself. But the more conversant we are with the way in which the creeds themselves were evolved through a period of centuries, the less shall we be disposed to see in them deliberate attempts at a complete statement of Christianity. The Creeds themselves were shaped by circumstances and designed to meet special circumstances. In many ways our circumstances are widely different from those of the Creed-making epoch. We have, I hope, a clearer conception of what is meant by the "Spirit of Christianity", and assign to it a higher value than to *mere* orthodoxy. Perceiving that Christianity was first of all a Life, not a Doctrine, we cannot fail to see that much of the Spirit of Christianity is to be found outside of the churches, just as Our Lord sometimes found greater faith in Gentiles than among Jews. The Catholic-minded man earnestly longs to see all that is of Christ in some

way within the fold. He longs for real fellowship with them. And since as we have seen Christianity, like everything else, is an unchanging spirit gradually embodying itself through varying forms, the Church's faith is not a thing of unchanging words. Its general purport is clear, and a general assent is therefore all that should be demanded for the *purpose of fellowship*, and the crying need of today, a need that will raise an even louder cry tomorrow, is the need of fellowship of kindred souls. For fellowship is quite consistent with the existence of groups (to avoid the term "denomination") of Christians. But groups are not necessarily divisions. With our knowledge of "temperament" and the variety of spiritual needs among people who are *educated and free*, we can scarcely hope that men will ever again agree on one type of service—that the Ritualist should foregather with Ritualist, the Quaker with Quaker, and, if you will, the Ranter with Ranter, is perfectly natural and proper. Yet do we not need some one great meeting place where all can sacramentally display their inner unity? And should not that service be the Lord's own appointed breaking of bread? Is there any real reason why the Holy Communion should be regarded as the peculiar act of inner circles? Is it not just this close communion in every form that has almost destroyed its power as the sacrament of human as well as of Divine fellowship? Let varying forms, and varying ideas find expression in groups if you will, but let the Holy Fellowship be for all who love our Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity and truth.

Thus may we achieve what alone seems possible, unity in variety—a unity which in great crises can make itself felt, a unity that will transcend (not destroy) national or cultural distinctions, a unity that will not be based on any kind of Absolution, but will be fully compatible with liberty because built upon the foundation stones of the Truth, the Liberty and the Love of the Gospel.

The Future of English Nonconformity

By William Edwin Orchard, D.D.

Nonconformity, like all other things to-day, is at the parting of the ways. It may not be aware of that, and this is the unfortunate element in the situation: not for its own sake alone, but because without some consciousness of the fact, and of the critical effect its choice may have on the future, it may drift down, or more deliberately choose, the wrong path. But Nonconformity *is* aware that it has been brought to a stand. Not only is it suffering, in common with most religious organizations, from a decline in numbers, but it is arrested by a certain flagging of interest in its own principles, as well as by the continual straying of wistful glances in hitherto forbidden directions. And Nonconformity has long known that it is suffering grave disadvantage, whether in contrast or conflict with Anglicanism, from its lack of unity and purpose. An effort was made some years ago to remedy this condition by forming the National Federation of the Free Churches. This body has, however, never been truly representative, for it is not officially elected by the contributing denominations, it has never attracted in any thing like due proportion the Wesleyan Methodists or the Presbyterians, and its political activity, inevitably tending in recent controversies to attach itself to one political party (in that no worse and no wiser than the Anglican Church), has alienated the sympathies of individual Nonconformists. Despite excellent work accomplished in many directions, and the valuable contact

which it has secured between the different denominations included in its organisation, it now seems to have lost its driving force and can hardly maintain interest even in its own constituency. But the movement has failed, only to give birth to the desire for a still closer degree of union. It is now being proposed that the Nonconformist Churches shall be *officially* federated. What these proposals may lead to is still speculative, although representation has now been officially secured from the various bodies in order to discuss the subject. The new movement has been undertaken on the imperative necessity of dealing with the grave problem of overlapping, especially in the villages, but not without the hope, more or less timidly expressed, that it may lead to a United Free Church of England.

One or two important considerations have to be borne in mind in trying to foresee the future of this movement. It is being continually affirmed that there is no intention of obliterating the different denominational constituents; they are to subsist as sub-sections of a more inclusive body, which for certain agreed purposes will act unitedly. Very little has been said during the preliminary discussions concerning Unity, as a thing desirable in itself, as something to be sought in fulfilment of our Lord's prayer, or as essential to the conversion of the world. This shows that the old apology, that the different denominations provided for varying temperament and therefore already constituted a richer unity, has not yet been recognised to be invalid. For, as a matter of fact, in matters of worship and in the practical working out of polity, an extraordinary similarity has developed, so that worshippers could not easily guess to what denomination a particular congregation belonged, without a close inspection of the Notice Board or the title page of the Hymn Book; while the laity move round from church to church and even take part in their government with little sense of awkwardness or difference. But in the non-official

circles, especially among the younger ministry, there is a great longing for the One Church. The scandal and weakness of disunion is felt acutely by them, and they ache to belong simply to the Church of Christ, catholic, historic and apostolic. Spiritually they do belong to that Church and they long to see the actual Church approximating to the unity of the Mystical Church. Despite the impatience with these desires as quixotic or even dangerous which is sometimes manifested by the older school of loyal denominationalists, it is encouraging to notice that hostility or opposition to the Anglican Church as a motive for the suggested combination is explicitly disowned, and it is continually stated that there must be no steps taken which are going to make still further steps in the direction of closer union with Anglicanism impossible. To have such expressions clearly voiced is, in view of the embittered bequest of past struggles and the not altogether hopeful pronouncements on present controversies, significant and cheering.

It may be that these hopes are buoyed up with the expectation that the Anglican Church will come nearer to the Nonconformist position; and there will certainly have to be a movement on both sides if any closer union is ever to be consummated. But this expectation sometimes takes the concrete form that the High Church party in Anglicanism will be defeated or secede to Romanism, leaving the Evangelical and Broad Church sections more open to the Free Church approach. The more orderly conduct of worship in Nonconformity, the gradual introduction of liturgical elements and the recognition of the value of such external aids as more churchly architecture, stained glass windows, robed choirs, etc., show a slow but undoubted approximation from the Free Church side to the spirit of Anglican worship. As a step in the same direction it may be found that the War will have considerably modified the historic attitude of Nonconformity towards the State, for the Free Churches as a

whole have given the full weight of their spiritual support to the State in its critical need, and in the case of their chaplains have shown that they are not unwilling to receive State aid. Their support of the war has necessitated somewhat of an alteration in their notions of the authority of the State even over matters of conscience, and it will probably be found that more has been surrendered than was recognised at the time. One can see here lines which will converge at no immeasurable distance.

Now it is precisely these lines of approach that others are hoping will not be taken. For the curious but undeniable fact is that among quite a section of Nonconformists the interest and attraction of Anglicanism is found in its High Church school. What is admired is the high doctrine of the Church which ends logically in the demand that the Church shall not be subordinate but superior to the State, and which uses the word Catholic as standing, among other things, for the supra-national. They reverence the earnestness, the unworldliness, the courage, the voluntary poverty, the socialistic leanings of many of the High Church clergy. They are attracted by the emphasis given to the Sacrament, to priesthood, to that type of worship which insists upon the union of inward disposition and outward expression, and to the personal piety which recognises the need of an ordered and disciplined life.

And yet no body of Free Churchmen goes over to High Anglicanism or is at present likely to do so. Indeed it is more than denominational and Free Church loyalty which keeps them where they are. It is rather a loyalty to what they believe to be the hope of the future. They value their freedom, not only as a freedom from State dictation, but as also enabling them to develop more swiftly and to include a wider variety both in worship and in theological expression. And they believe that the spirit of catholic devotion and the true high churchman-

ship is hindered for many by the Roman system and has not found its right expression in the Oxford Movement. They are not averse to "orders," so long as they derive their authority from the whole Body of Christ, nor to superior offices, if only they are filled by men deliberately elected because of their truly representative character as spiritually equipped and typical of the Church's life and outlook. They do not resent discipline and obedience if only it is not patterned after the military but after the true ecclesiastical type; namely, a discipline for service and an obedience which owns only the bondage to love one another. They are hungry for the recognition and realization of that Real Presence of Christ which the reverent and beautiful celebration of the Sacrament supremely gives; but they require no subtle doctrine or borrowing from magical notions to believe that Christ is present in the Lord's Supper, as in no other way. They approach this mystery sure that the psychological and philosophical reasons for choosing this way were intuitively known by the Lord, for they find in sacramentalism the outlines of the only possible doctrine of the relation of spirit and matter as well as the greatest of all sanctions for relating Christianity to social and economic questions. They want the priesthood of all believers set forth and represented, holding as they do that the Church is necessary in order to bring home to the world all the effectiveness of God's forgiveness and the benefits of Christ's passion. And they believe that the Free Churches, and at present they alone, can safely revive catholic doctrine and devotion so as to bring them to the common people with no taint or suspicion of those things against which the Reformation was rightly though not always perspicaciously in protest.

The Free Churches when closer united may, however, elect to move along the more natural lines of their own historic development, laying less and less emphasis upon the Church as a supernatural and priestly Body and

more and more avoiding sacramentalism. This will have the undoubted effect of still further depleting their church consciousness and leaving them with a Gospel which will less and less satisfy the craving of the heart; and as a result many minds may be forced to consider Anglicanism as an alternative. For there are those who crave a Church which is not something they have to create and support but rather a living organism which creates and supports them; and the longing for the Sacrament which alone satisfies and consummates their devotion to Christ, yet which seems so incomprehensible to some Free Churchmen, is clamant, crops up in quite unsuspected quarters, and is likely to deepen and extend.

Or it may be that the other approach towards a Low and somewhat Erastian Church may succeed, and that will throw many Anglican and perhaps some Free Churchmen over to Rome, for despite its inclusion of many things which they dislike it alone seems to secure for them the things that are essential. It is a strange movement, it could not perhaps as yet give clear reasons for itself, but it is simple blindness or fear that refuses to recognise its existence. But what we are concerned about is that either of these alternatives will mean in the end that the real contribution of the Free Churches to the Church of the future will be lost. For, if only the Free Churches could recapture the devotion and spiritual ideals of Catholicism while retaining their own principles, we might yet see a Catholic Church which exercised authority, not by lording it over the brethren, but by love, which kept the Church loyal, not by legal instruments and threats of penalties, but by a purely spiritual centripetal attraction; a Church faithful to the past, atoning for its errors, and able to meet the future; a Church using its priestly and sacramental powers, not to bar and exclude, but to set Christ freely and vividly before the world.

Whether this more excellent way, holding as it seems to do the hope of the widest possible union, can be dis-

covered and taken, depends upon whether the Free Churches can grow the men who will set forth these ideals by clear convincing thought, unselfish labour and sacrificing lives, men capable of far-reaching vision and a patient pursuit through good and ill report of the vision they have seen; and whether the rank and file of the Free Churches will be able to discern that this is a real, new movement to be prayed for and given room and not merely an empty and suspicious reaction to be watched, feared and thwarted.

The Lutheran Church in Holland

By Professor Dr. J. W. Pont,
University of Utrecht.

The Lutheran church in Holland is one of the smallest churches in the world and yet it is divided into two sections, each possessing a character of its own. Not even a sixtieth part of the Dutch population belongs to it. The question therefore arises: Will it be of any interest for the readers of The Constructive Quarterly to learn something about that church? I believe it will. For, though it is a very small church, it had nevertheless in former centuries a world-wide influence. The Lutheran churches in a part of America[1], in Africa[2] and Asia[3] are

[1] Cf. *The Lutheran Church in Pennsylvania, 1638–1800*, by Theodore Emanuel Schmauk, D. D. (The Pennsylvania-German Society), Vol. XI, p. 20, n. 21: "On June 6, 1657, the Lutherans in New Amsterdam having petitioned the Lutheran church at Amsterdam for a pastor, the first pastor, Johannes Ernst Goetwasser, arrived. Thus began the Dutch-Lutheran congregation in New York, which now, with many changes, is the oldest Lutheran congregation in America."

Georg J. Fritschel, *Gesch. der Luth. Kirche in Amerika* (Gütersloh, 1896), I. The first chapter about the Lutheran church in Holland is not in touch with the latest advance in historical learning. The same with the article about the Dutch Lutheran church in Lenker's *Die Lutherische Kirche der Welt* (Sunbury, Pennsylvanien. Verlag von Lutheran in All Lands Company, 1901), I.

[2] In the 18th century the only Lutheran church in Africa was to be found in Capetown. Cf. my *Nieuwe Bijdragen tot kennis van de geschiedenis en het wezen van het Lutheranisme in de Nederlanden* (Amsterdam, ten Brink en de Vries), III, p. 37 sq., VII, p. 185 sq. (1910 and 1916).

[3] The history of the Lutheran church in Batavia is to be found in *Bijdragen tot de geschiedenis d. Evang. Luth. kerk in de Nederlanden*, by J. C. Schultz Jacobi and F. J. Domela Nieuwenhuis, VI, p. 83 sq. (Utrecht 1845).

its daughter churches and their organization is a typical Dutch one.

The history of this small Lutheran church is an interesting one. It originated in the sixteenth century, the century of the Reformation. It was then for the whole Western Europe a time of spiritual awakening. In the Netherlands people were already more accustomed to personal freedom than in any other part of the Continent, and there was also a strong longing for liberty of conscience. There was a general expectation of something new. The Roman Catholic church was losing its hold on the people and therefore, as Luther had promulgated his ninety-five theses, every one looked upon him as the coming reformer. His personality soon became very popular. His translation of the New Testament, his books of devotion were soon translated and read. From the correspondence still preserved one can see that his advice was sought in many difficult questions.

But his popularity diminished in the same proportion as Anabaptism grew. People could not understand his antagonism towards the Anabaptists, who represented in Germany the peasants and the labouring classes, who also longed for more social freedom. The Anabaptists, with their enthusiastic ideas, electrified the crowds who sympathized with the German peasants, persecuted with Luther's sanction.

There was another reason for the weakening of his influence: the monasteries, which at first were the main abodes of his followers, were destroyed, and Dutch people, on the other hand, could not understand his conception of the Eucharistic doctrine, already known here in 1529. It was a too catholic one for the radical people of the Netherlands, where the conception of Hoen, Zwingli and others was almost a product of the native land. The doctrine of consubstantiation, of the omnipresence of Christ and all the specific Lutheran doctrines were in

these days little appreciated in Holland, except by German residents, mostly members of German commercial houses with their factories in Antwerp, Bruges and other towns.

However, as long as every heretical opinion in Holland was oppressed and it was dangerous to be a non-Catholic Christian, there was apparently some unity between "Sacramentarians", "Lutherans", and, since 1560," Calvinists". With the introduction of religious freedom the differences among the Protestants became more evident. The year 1566 bears witness to it.

This year is called the "wonderful year". In August an uprising took place in Antwerp. In order to suppress it, the Prince of Orange by a provisional permit allowed the Protestants to build their own churches and to hold their services. It became then evident that they were much divided against themselves. The Reformed section adhered to the doctrines of Bullinger, Calvin, Beza and others; a smaller section, comprising the foreign elements, such as Germans, Norwegians, Danes, residing in Antwerp, adhered to Lutheranism. The antagonism between these two sections grew stronger in the last months of 1566.

In October, German theologians came to organize the Lutheran churches; they composed the Antwerpian Lutheran confession, a liturgy, and wrote some small books of devotion. These theologians were very fond of debates with the Reformed, the subjects under discussion being theological as well as political questions.

The Reformed consistories believed that it would be in accordance with the will of God to remove the government, should it offend the privileges of the people and restrict religious freedom. They prepared for revolt and hired soldiers to defend them in time of peril. Their small army was, however, defeated by the Spaniards, in the neighbourhood of Antwerp, in March, 1567. This defeat caused in the town a serious tumult. The rebels had at

first the upper hand. The Government then invoked the assistance of all inhabitants to set up order, and the Lutherans, the Roman Catholics, the Spaniards and others sided with the Prince of Orange and the Government. They opposed the Reformed who were now in the minority and so the revolt was suppressed. Since that day the Reformed in Holland have trusted neither the religious nor the patriotic feelings of the Lutherans. For the Reformed principle is in political matters quite the opposite of the Lutheran one, the Lutherans emphasizing the saying: "Every subject must obey the government authorities, for no authority exists apart from God" (Rom. 13:1; Moffat). You must either obey the Government, even if it is an oppressor, or you must leave the country.

Soon after these terrible days the Spanish general, the Duke of Alba, came to the Netherlands with his troops and all Protestants had to take to flight, being in danger of their lives. Many Lutherans escaped to Germany and the Rhine provinces, where the government was a Catholic one, and here the Dutch-Lutheran fugitives organized their small churches.[4]

Luther was a prophet, not an organizer. He has given neither a system of theology nor one of church government. The church was to him a spiritual reality; it is everywhere where the Word and the Sacraments are. It is a *communio sanctorum*, "*ein heiliges Häuflein und Gemeine auf Erden eiteler Heiligen unter einem Haupte* (*Christo*)". In one of his first writings he expresses the hope that the true Christians will come together and choose their own ministers, form their own religious service and establish their own church. But afterwards he learned that this would be impossible, because the spiritual life of the greater part of the people and the church was not strong enough to do

[4] Cf. for the history and the organization of the Lutheran church my *Geschiedenis van het Lutheranisme in de Nederlanden tot 1618* (Haarlem, Bohn, 1911), p. 311 sqq.

it. The life of the church, however, had to be protected in the struggle against Roman Catholicism; therefore he thought it would be the safest thing to put the church under the patronage of the state, the princes being the first in the church, the "*principium membrum ecclesiae*". Thus he tries to save the gospel for the people and the people for the gospel.

In a country with no Lutheran government the question now arose: Is it possible to have here also a Lutheran church? Some negated it, for instance, Flacius Illyricus, the renowned dogmatist and controversialist, who had lived for some time in Antwerp and knew the Dutch people fairly well. He fully adhered to the principle which prevailed in Germany: "*cujus regio eius religio*". If you could not live in peace in your country under the reign of a Lutheran ruler, you might better leave your country.

Dutch Lutherans partly agreed with him and partly opposed; those who agreed went for baptism to the Roman Catholic church, in the belief that it was in agreement with Luther's own views. Their opponents, who could not attend the Catholic service and loved their country too much to desert it, believed their opinion to be the true Lutheran one, more in accordance with the opinions of Luther himself than that of Flacius. Many controversial pamphlets were written by both parties. At last, in 1578, Antwerpian Lutherans became convinced that they were right in having a Lutheran church in a country where the government was a Catholic or a Reformed one.

The first Dutch Lutheran church was established in Aix-la-Chapelle.[5] They called it a "house-chapel", because

[5] Prof. D. A. Harnack says in his: *Die evang. soziale Aufgabe im Lichte der Geschichte der Kirche* (*Bericht über die Verhandlungen des 5. Ev. soz. Kongresses*, 158), that there were no Lutheran congregations of fugitives in the sixteenth century such as the Reformed had, but the Lutheran congregations in Aix-la-Chapelle, Cologne, etc. were such congregations. Cf. also Prof. Lic. Ed. Simons, *Niederrheinisches Synodal- und Gemeindeleben "unter dem Kreuz"* (Freiburg, 1897).

divine service was held in a house of one of the members. They organized themselves in the best possible way. The most remarkable thing in their organization was the position of the elders. They are the principal persons in the church. They call the minister and depose him. A minister was in these days not appointed for life, but for three months or half a year, and could be deposed, if he did not please. The life of many ministers in these days was a tragical one; especially that of the travelling ministers, who officiated in more than one congregation.

The elders had also power over the deacons, who had to render them account of the money entrusted to them. In one word, they were the rulers of the church. So it was in the different Dutch Lutheran congregations in the Rhine provinces and in the Netherlands, for not only in Aix-la-Chapelle (1569), but also in Cologne (1574), Wesel (1602), Antwerp (1578), Brussels (1578), Woerden (1580), Amsterdam (1588) and, since the siege of Antwerp by the Spaniards (1588), in different towns of the northern parts of the Netherlands these small Lutheran churches were established.

The elders were chosen by the members of the congregation. Twice a year the election took place. But, the congregations being very small, with the exception of Amsterdam, and the minority of members well-to-do, the same persons therefore were often elected. In the beginning, in the time of struggle, nobody objected to it, but afterwards it became very clear that the election of the same persons had very bad consequences.

This position of the elders is in agreement with the Lutheran principle; they are "the provisional substitutes of the magistrate".[6] Lutherans in Holland adhered to the opinion of Luther, that the church had to be put

[6] Therefore D. Stangen, Superintendent of Oldenburg, wrote in 1604 to the elders in Amsterdam, that they are "a special magistracy in the congregation and have the same power as princes"; Cf. my *Nieuwe Bijdragen* etc. II, p. 182.

under the patronage of the state. Now, as long as the rulers of Holland were "not yet Lutheran", they elected a "provisional magistrate". Therefore the elders always had to be elected out of the most influential and the richest members of the congregation.[7]

The power of the elders made itself felt in every congregation throughout the whole history of the church, and I think that in the oldest American church, in the Lutheran church of New York, the position of elders has been for a long time as prominent as in old Amsterdam, where, in the years of the Dutch emigration to Manhattan Island (in 1644 sq.), there existed a large congregation of no less than 30,000 Lutherans. In Holland their position has been changed in the eighteenth century, and still more in the nineteenth, a new organization being introduced in 1819 by King William I. The only remnant of the power of former times still in evidence is in Amsterdam.

The position of the minister in the Dutch Lutheran churches was also a peculiar one. He had no influence at all on any material question. In questions of doctrine he was, however, the sole authority. This has been a cause of much trouble. For the ministers were not always of the same opinion, and who could decide in a conflict between them? Already in the first years of their existence serious conflicts were harassing the small congregations, and frequently with fatal results, as nobody could stop the quarreling, the ministers themselves being divided. In such cases the elders always consulted the theological faculty of one or other German Lutheran University, asking for a decision in the matter in question. For the prevailing opinion was that the theologian alone knew the will of God.

This principle has been a very serious one for the

[7] It is the same in the Baltic provinces, where the Lutheran church is an institution of the German nobility. The President of the Consistory must always be a member of the nobility, while the superintending pastor is only the vice-president; the majority is assured to the lay nobility.

Dutch Lutheran church. The Calvinists scoffed at it, and called it a remnant of Catholicism as they do not know any difference between a cleric and a layman, "all of them being taught by God". In the course of time many Lutherans adhered more or less to the same opinion. For, though nearly all the Dutch Lutherans immigrated either from Germany or the Scandinavian kingdoms and cherished in the beginning their German Lutheran ideas, their sons and daughters were impregnated with the Dutch spiritual atmosphere, full of other ideas.

The idea of separation, which is not a Lutheran one, was already ripe at the end of the seventeenth century in the hearts of an important part of the Amsterdam congregation. They were not at all satisfied with the newly elected ministers, nor with the elders, reigning as usual without considering the will of the congregation, but as soon as they began to separate, the political government, which had to allow the establishment of a new church, refused its permission, and so they had to remain in the church, which in the opinion of the Government was a true Lutheran one.

But towards the end of the eighteenth century (1791) a wide separation took place. It led to the establishment of a second Lutheran church: "the restored Evangelical-Lutheran church", where the laity had a prominent place in the church government and a strong influence on the election of ministers. In other Lutheran congregations the election of ministers is the work of elders and deacons, the congregation itself being almost without any influence. The organization of the Lutheran churches in Holland is not the same as in the reformed churches; it is not presbyterian, for the elders are the "provisional substitutes of the magistrate" and the ministers no "teaching presbyters", but almost priests—"theologians, who know the will of God". In the course of time their position has been modified, preserving, however, its original character in some of the regulations of today.

The organization of the Dutch Lutheran churches, as well as its form of public worship, is a peculiar one. Those who are accustomed to attend divine service in the Lutheran churches of Germany, Sweden, etc. are astonished to see the simple chapels used by the Dutch. Everything is so plain; no painted walls, no altar, no crucifix, no ceremonies during the service, no liturgy. Generally the church is oblong, with two or more galleries, a pulpit, a clock and an organ. Most churches have also a wooden screen and within its space are the pews for elders and deacons and also the pulpit. Formerly there used to be also a place for the precentor, but in the nineteenth century in most churches they have done away with him. Some screens were in later times removed, and it is therefore possible to find the beautiful chiselled screen of the Lutheran church of Alkmaar in the Albert and Victoria Museum in London.[8] Within this space you will also find in most chapels a small table, used for baptism and communion service.

The divine service is very simple; it is nearly the same as in the Dutch Reformed church, but more simple than in the Presbyterian churches of England.

A foreigner who visits our churches is soon struck with one of the peculiarities of the Dutch Protestant people, who seem to lack due respect for public worship. Dr. A. Kuyper, the renowned neo-Calvinist, a man of high position and of mighty influence in Holland, writes in his book about "Worship":[9] "It would be something quite unnatural if the worshippers were silent in the church before the beginning of service, for they are brethren; they are acquainted with each other, and therefore they converse with each other." He would like, if it were possible, to make next to the chapel a large room where worshippers

[8] Cf. my article about that screen in my *Nieuwe Bijdragen*, etc VI, p. i.

[9] Dr. A. Kuyper, *Onze eeredienst. Kampen* (J. H. Kok, 1911), p. 160 sq.

could converse before attending divine service. They would in due time enter the chapel with the minister. In general, public opinion in Holland maintains that it is not necessary to keep silent in church before the service. Silence ensues with the appearance of the minister in the pulpit.

The service itself consists of singing, praying and preaching. In former times all Lutheran hymns were translated German ones; even the Psalms were translated from the German, though there were also Dutch Psalms, sung in the Reformed churches. In the nineteenth century this was changed. First of all, the "restored Lutheran" church inserted the reformed Psalms in its hymnbook (1857), and later on, they were sung in other churches. Since that time more original Dutch hymns and translations of English and French hymns have been sung. There is not much singing during the service. Only if a hymn is very short, can it be sung entirely, but usually only two or three verses are sung. Singing in most churches takes up much time, because it is slow. In the last ten years some improvement has taken place, especially in larger towns.

The greater part of the service is taken up by the sermon. Usually it takes more than half an hour or even an hour. Formerly the Sunday service lasted two hours, the week-day service one hour. And the minister was obliged to be punctual. Thus there was a resolution of the elders of Amsterdam, in the seventeenth century, that "the precentor had to begin to sing with the striking of the clock and not to wait till the minister is ready with his address". Such resolutions are no longer in use and no longer necessary, for the service on Sundays generally lasts about an hour and a half.

The simplicity of the service is very striking to a foreigner. Often therefore the question arises: How is it possible that a Lutheran church should have no altar, no liturgy, no ceremonies? To this question history gives the answer. In Lutheran countries such as Germany,

Sweden, Norway, Denmark, the old Catholic churches were adapted for Lutheran service; a great deal of the old Catholic ceremonies was preserved; the Lutheran church became the national church, and the people, accustomed to the old liturgy, were glad to have as few alterations as possible. Luther himself set the example. In the beginning he meant that only prayer and the word of God should be used in divine service; it ought to have a plain character. In these days he called himself "*iniquus ceremoniis etiam necessariis, hostis autem non necessariis*". He was very indifferent to the ceremonial, but he soon perceived that the common people could not bear radical improvements. Therefore he would retain all that was not in defiance of the Gospel, such as priestly vestments, albs, wax candles, crucifix, altar paintings, yes, even for some time the elevation of the bread and the communion-cup. He hoped that the time would come wherein all these ceremonies would be changed as a matter of course, the Gospel being better understood. But he hoped in vain. His followers clung to all he either introduced or left unchanged, because it was his work.[10]

So matters stood in Saxony and the Northern parts of Germany, but in Southern Germany another spirit prevailed. Here the Sunday divine service had assumed a different character. In Würtemberg there was no longer a service like the old Roman mass, ending in a communion, the object of the service being the edification of the believers. Communion could take place in special communion-services. The main thing in every service was the preaching of the word of God and prayer. The altars, still standing in the old churches, were no longer used. So it was in Würtemberg and in other parts of Southern Germany.[11] There was still more difference between both

[10] Cf. D. Franz Rendtorff, *Die Geschichte des Christl. Gottesdienstes unter dem Gesichtspunkte der liturgischen Erbfolge: Eine Grundlegung der Liturgik* (Gieszen, 1914, A. Topelmann).

[11] Cf. D. Chr. Kolb, *Die Geschichte des Gottedienstes in der evangelischen Kirche Wurttembergs* (Stuttgart, Belser, 1913), S. 30 sq.

parts of Germany in the days of the Reformation in religious matters. It is not improbable that the neighbourhood of Switzerland and the influence of the Anabaptist movement, which was very strong in this part of Germany, should have brought it about. Anyhow the difference is considerable. And now you can find the same spirit in the Western part of Germany, in the Eifel mountains. And from these parts of Germany, from Düren, Schleiden, Aix-la-Chapelle, the first Lutheran ministers came to Holland.

They were not accustomed to any liturgy, altar-service, communion-services, and so they made the divine services in the house-chapels as simple as they were in their own country. And even now this plain service is to be found in the Lutheran churches of Holland, in all towns where house-chapels are established. They are only to be found in the larger towns, with exception of very few chapels established in the nineteenth century. For Lutheranism was not officially acknowledged in former centuries in the Netherlands. The States General, which tolerated the Lutheran services in the towns, forbade every service in the country. The only village for which an exception was made in the seventeenth century is Bodegraven, and in the eighteenth, Groede. But Bodegraven belonged in the sixteenth century to Erick von Brunswick, a Lutheran prince, and so the Confession of Augsburg was adhered to by a part of the population; and Groede was in the eighteenth century an asylum for the Saltzburgians, who were driven out of their country by the Roman Catholics. The full official acknowledgment of the Lutherans took place in the beginning of the nineteenth century, when religious freedom was given to every church. Since that time, Lutheranism could develop itself as far as was possible, but in reality there has not been any development at all, the Lutherans being diminished in numbers in proportion to the increase of the population.

Amongst the dogmatical questions which influenced

the Dutch Lutheran church, those of original sin and of the omnipresence of Christ were in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries the most important ones. In the Formula of Concord, the Lutheran confession of 1580, the question of original sin, a question moved by Flacius Illyricus, who learned that sin is not an "accidence" but the "substance" of man, is settled in such a manner that his followers opposed and would not subscribe to the Formula. A large part of the Dutch Lutheran church adhered to Flacius and many ministers were his followers. So the Formula was not acknowledged in Holland. Much dissension took place and the small congregations were destroyed by this conflict. It has been told that in the County of Mansfeld in Germany, "*Accedenter*" (the adherents of the doctrine that sin is an "accidens") and "*Substansianer*" (followers of Flacius) fought with each other in the streets and in the public houses as in former centuries did the Arians and their opponents. And similar things happened here also, but not to such an extent.

In the course of time these conflicts diminished, because the elders elected only such ministers as promised not to speak about this doctrine, and nearly every congregation made its own confession, which had to be subscribed to by every minister elected. So there was a "*Confessio Wordensis, Middelburgensis, etc. de peccato originali*", confessions now forgotten and no more to be found; the only confession "*de peccato originali*" still existing is the Antwerpian one of 1579.[12] In the beginning of the seventeenth century, with the death of Joost van den Populiere, the zealot in this question (1611), this doctrine lost its attraction and the Formula of Concord was accepted.

There is still another confession which bears a Dutch character, a confession "*de omnipraesentia Christi*". It was made in Amsterdam. Petrus Plancius, one of the Reformed ministers, a man of high influence, renowned as

[12] Cf. The "Confessio Antverpiensis de peccato originali, Anno 1579" in my *Nieuwe Bijdragen* I, p. 121.

geographer as well as theologian, a first-class controversialist, preached on Ascension Day, 1603, against the Lutherans and their doctrine of the omnipresence of Christ. He was a very popular man, not free from vulgarity; so he made of this doctrine a caricature. His metaphors are very vulgar; it is impossible to translate them. His sermon "caught on". The Lutherans were scoffed at and they had to defend themselves. They were not allowed to have their divine services any longer. Philipp Nicolai, the Lutheran minister of Hamburg, also a very renowned controversialist, in a remarkable pamphlet with a letter to the States General, wrote that, "It was the duty of the States General to be very kind towards the Lutherans, because they were the only people who brought the Gospel to the Dutch; the Calvinists being Mahometans and the Catholics non-Christians." But his pamphlet did more harm than good. The elders and the ministers of the congregation of Amsterdam wrote their own confession and submitted it to the government of the town.[13] The Government accepted it but did not change its official attitude. Some time afterwards the Lutherans managed to hold their services in an unassuming manner, and in a year or so the church recovered its former position.

The Dutch Lutheran church has been wholly dependent for its doctrinal and spiritual life on German theology till the nineteenth century. Its ministers had to study at a German University. This also has been one of the causes of conflict which has been harmful to the church. The greater part of the Germans, who came to Holland as confectioners, butchers, bakers, retail-dealers, etc., intermarried in their adopted country and became Dutchmen, had Dutch kindred, Dutch friends and Dutch ideas. The latter were under the influence of France, this country being in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries the most influential here. On the other hand, Germans were

[13] Cf. Dr. F. J. Domela Nieuwenhuis, *Geschiedenis der Amsterdamsche gemeente, Bijlage D. blz.* 70 (Amsterdam, 1856).

continuously emigrating to Holland and joining the Lutheran church. Two distinct currents made themselves felt in the church, resulting in some friction between the more and the less Hollandized Lutherans, the Dutch and the German party. Sometimes theological, sometimes political questions divided them, sometimes both.

So matters stood at the end of the eighteenth century, a time of theological and political commotion. In Germany rationalism prevailed. The younger ministers were nearly all rationalists, for they had studied in Germany. Well-to-do people liked it and preferred the ministers who preached rationalism. Others, the lower classes, asked for the old Gospel and ministers who preached it. So every vacancy of a minister was a cause of much difficulty and dissension. The rationalists had the majority and used it accordingly.

There was also another question, another point of controversy. Two political parties divided the people: the Patriots and the Orangists. Most of the well-to-do people were patriots, and also the middle-classes, to which elders, deacons, etc., belonged. They looked up to France, glorified France and expected all from it. The lower classes, however, as well as the highest, were Orangists; they were attached to the Prince of Orange. At the time when these controversies were dividing the congregation, a vacancy occurred in Amsterdam, in 1791. Though a very large part of the congregation had asked the church wardens to elect a minister of the old Gospel, the latter paid no attention to the request and elected a rationalistic one. Very deeply disappointed, many subscribers to the request separated themselves, on the day following the election, from the church and established a "restored Evangelical Lutheran church". The civil Government of Amsterdam allowed the establishment of this new Lutheran church, a church afterwards called the "Orangists' church", and Johannes Hamelau, one of the ministers of the abandoned church, assisted them. Thus a second

Lutheran congregation was established in Amsterdam, which from the beginning bore a truly Dutch character. It was determined immediately that its ministers should study in Holland, and so the plan of a Dutch theological seminary arose in their midst. A new confession was made (1791), and soon the congregation had its own church government and its own divine service.

And so we see at the beginning of the nineteenth century two Lutheran churches in Holland with their own organization, and their own character, and now, at the beginning of the twentieth century, they still exist.

At present both churches stand and work side by side without having any official bond. An effort was made during the nineteenth century to reunite them, but in vain. The "restored" church has still in its regulations an article that makes reunion possible; it also allows its congregations to call as minister a member of the other church, if he is willing to subscribe to the principles of the church; the "Evangelical", however, has broken every bond and deals with the "restored Lutheran" as with every other denominational church. This is due partly to the difference in principles that exists between both churches and their Synods. The Evangelical one may be called a "neutral" church, a church without confession, the "restored Evangelical" one will be a Lutheran church in the historical sense of the word and has a confession. The term "neutral" seems an inappropriate one for a church, but nevertheless it is a correct one. For there are in this church Unitarians as well as Trinitarians; members who love their church because it is the church of their fathers or because they confess Lutheran principles; and others, who belong to this church, being born in it, though they do not trouble much about Lutheranism and only long for absolute liberty of conscience, the church in their opinion not confessing but seeking the truth.

The congregations of this church, therefore, differ greatly

from each other in spiritual matters, and so there are different factions in the Synod, where serious conflicts have taken place. Last year, the Unitarians, having the majority, tried to settle all questions by taking the following decision: "That no regulation, and no conclusion, taken by the Synod should contain anything that is in defiance of the religious liberty of the congregations or of particular members". So every congregation and every member is quite free in his religious opinions. Any person being admitted as member of the church will have to confess, in one congregation, the Apostles' creed, or to answer in the affirmative the questions of the old form for the confirmation of new members; in another congregation, however, he will not have to confess any belief at all, but only have to answer in the affirmative the questions the minister likes to put to him. Nobody is prohibited by his confession from being a member of the Evangelical Lutheran church, but, "if he acts against Christian ethics or against the regulations of the church", he is subject to the discipline of the church and can be excluded.

The religious freedom of the members of the church is almost absolute, but every minister has to subscribe to a very elastic formula before entering on his duties. He has to profess "that he will take to heart the interest of Christianity and of the Dutch Lutheran church in his word and his life, and will apply himself to the advancement of religious knowledge, Christian faith, good morals, order and concord, and also that he will act in accordance with the regulations of the church". This formula, open to more than one explanation—"Christian faith" not being a very strict term—is subscribed to by Unitarians and Trinitarians.

In practice, the Evangelical Lutheran church tries to be really neutral. Its members, *e.g.* can be either *baptized* or *non-baptized*; the church being indifferent in regard to baptism. I believe this church is the first church that bears the "Lutheran" name, that is indifferent in regard

to baptism. At least I do not know of any other Lutheran church in the world with non-baptized members; baptism always had in Lutheran churches a prominent place. Not every congregation, however, acknowledges non-baptized members as members. These congregations are right in doing so. So you may be a member of the Evangelical Lutheran church in Holland and no member of the congregation in the town where you live. It is the consequence of neutrality, not a happy one. But who will succeed in finding the quadrature of the circle?

Formerly the outward uniformity corresponded with inner unity, but now there is no inner unity at all. Therefore only a very superficial bond can bind congregations and members. Absolute, real freedom is necessary for the existence of such a church, that is a conglomeration of congregations with opposing principles, and therefore no Synod, no conference should have powers to take a decision that binds others in spiritual matters. Even the election of the minister has to be in the hands of the congregation itself, without any limitation, otherwise there will always be some spiritual oppression. For in this church there will always exist opposing parties, and the history of the church has taught that not only for political parties might often is right.

So the only bond in the Evangelical Lutheran church that binds congregations and members can be, after accepting the regulation I mentioned above, a financial and historical one: the bond of a name, which speaks of a time whan all congregations were united by a spiritual and a national tie expressed in the Augsburg Confession.

The "restored Evangelical Lutheran church" bears quite a different character. Here is inner unity and outward, though no rigid, uniformity, with variations corresponding to the diversity of the congregations. The church as a church has a confession. It will be a Lutheran church and stand for the principles of historical Lutheran-

ism. Every minister has to subscribe to a formula which describes the principle of reformation as "the justification of the sinner by grace alone for Christ's sake through faith", and also acknowledges the authority of Holy Scripture. Every congregation has the same confession. The church is small. Its government is a democratic one; all congregations being represented in its Synod and the members of the congregations—in some of them even the women—participating in the election of the minister. There is unity in this church and, though small, it has had and has influence.

The Lutheran churches in Holland are in this century no longer German churches as before. Germans coming to Holland have in Rotterdam and in The Hague their own German churches; only in Amsterdam there is still a German pastor connected with the Reformed and with the Evangelical Lutheran church. So the number of Lutherans is neither increasing by the influx of Germans nor among the Dutch themselves, the people in Holland being more inclined towards Calvinism. But notwithstanding that, the different congregations have still before them a beautiful spiritual task, if they are loyal to their own principles. So their work will be a blessing for the country and for the advance of the kingdom of God.

The Religious Consciousness as a Psychological Fact

By Herbert L. Stewart,

Professor of Philosophy, Dalhousie University, Halifax, N. S.

The newborn "science of religions" is a very significant mark of the time in which we live. Forty years ago such a thing would have been impossible. It would have been equally rejected, on the one hand by those who thought that matters of faith are wholly inscrutable by reason—even profaned by its touch—and on the other by those who looked on such matters as relics of a dying superstition, undeserving of serious study. It is hard for us to imagine what the English leaders of the "Oxford Movement", Newman, Keble, Pusey, would have said if they had foreseen Comparative Religion side by side with Comparative Zoology. But we can guess at the amazement of the mid-Victorian scientists, of Huxley, Tyndall, Clifford. A separate Religions Department of the British Association would have been as unintelligible to them as a separate section on witchcraft. To realize how far we have advanced from those days of dogmatism countered by scepticism, one has only to look at an old volume of the Reviews, marking the ecclesiastical thunders on the one side and the scientific taunts on the other. The negative philosophers were ready to beguile a leisure hour in baiting an Archbishop about the six days of Creation, or rallying Mr. Gladstone about the Gadarene

swine. But the note of seriousness was strangely absent,[1] and among the theologians there was little sympathetic handling of honest unbelief. Today one could scarcely arouse a ripple of interest in questions upon which the whole issue was then thought to turn.

The change is one of level. "Fancy with fact", said Browning, "is just one fact the more", and spiritual phenomena have at length taken their place as calling for explanation at least equally with any other phenomena; they have to be accounted for, valued, fitted into their place in the web of man's experience. Those who "explained" through mingled fraud and credulity have gone, as Burke said of Deism, "to the vault of all the Capulets". There has been a like change on the orthodox side. Preachers on Christian Evidence no longer "try the apostles for perjury once a week". For the significant phenomena are not so much phenomena of the remote past about which historians may wrangle; they are phenomena which confront us in the immediate present.

To begin with, they are universal. Wherever you go, through the savage islands of the Malay Archipelago, through the tribes of the Australian bush, through archaic civilizations like the Chinese or the Indian, and again among the modern peoples of Europe and America, you cannot find a race that has not some variety of religious ideas. The investigation is closely analogous with that of moral codes. Among the ups and downs of moral feeling, among the endlessly diverse valuations of good and bad, the moralist has to elicit a common ground, a common element. As Plato put it, he must discover what is the Good in all good things, and the Bad in all bad things. So too from religions we must extract the essence of Re-

[1] Cf. Carlyle's judgment of Voltaire: "It is much more serious ground of offence that he intermeddled in religion without being himself in any measure religious; that he entered the Temple and continued there with a levity, which, in any Temple where men worship, can beseem no brother man."

ligion. The native of Borneo bowing before a block of wood, a Hindoo bathing in the holy Ganges, a Confucian paying homage to the spirits of his ancestors, a Mohammedan turning to Mecca, a Roman Catholic invoking the Virgin, a Protestant at his simple forms of praise and prayer—they are all bone of our bone and flesh of our flesh; despite the diversity there is something akin about them. Is it one great impulse that expresses itself in these varying ways? One root that has such different blossoms? Can we say what that thing is which makes man, wherever man is found, a worshipper?

It is usual to distinguish in religion between two sides, an element of creed and an element of feeling. Something is believed, certain emotions accompany the belief, certain actions are associated, or should be associated, with the whole. Awe, reverence, gratitude,—these are conspicuous among the religious emotions. But which comes first, the creed or the feeling? "He that cometh unto God", said S. Paul, "must believe that He is, and that He is the rewarder of them that diligently seek Him." But did S. Paul mean that one must first, on cold intellectual grounds, as a conviction of the reason, have come to believe in a Divine Being, and that as a result he goes on to feel in certain ways and to do certain things? This is surely a false way of interpreting the human mind. According to E. B. Tylor, still by far our foremost historian of primitive culture, the original impulse to religion was a kind of curiosity mingled with fear. Early man was no scientist; he knew nothing of natural law. Hence the world that he looked out upon was for him full of marvels. The only cause by which he could explain them would be a being or beings more or less malignant towards himself, whom it would be wise to conciliate lest he should perish in the divine anger. Thus side by side with his savage beliefs there would grow up a set of fearful emotions, and a system of ritual designed to ward off the destructive impulses of the gods.

But this tends, surely, to an over-emphasis of the intellectual. When the primitive creed disappeared, why did not the fabric which rested upon it far more completely collapse? The half-informed rationalistic press takes it as an axiom that this must occur, and as an historical fact that it has occurred. It declares that as reflective thought advances religion necessarily recedes. It depicts the record of this relationship as one of progressive encroachment by reason and progressive capitulation by faith. Huxley put it in his vivid flamboyant way when he said, "Round the cradle of every new science lie the remains of slaughtered theologians, like strangled snakes round the infant Hercules." But the truth is that such abandonment of faith has proceeded nothing like as fast or as far as such a theory, if it were adequate, would lead one to expect. There were two ways in which this triumph of reason was supposed to act. Sceptics of the coarser grain did not scruple to say that religion grew out of conscious deceit, that it was devised by a cunning priesthood, that it was maintained as an engine of priestly power, and that it is fated to collapse as soon as knowledge shall have freed the dupes from their credulity. Those of finer discernment looked upon it as a sort of pathetic delusion, an emotional imposture by man upon himself, possible only so long as he remains too ignorant or too timid to face facts. They spoke of religion as finding room to breathe only in the *lacunae* of science; it was thus easy to conjecture what would happen as the *lacunae* were filled up. Professor Gilbert Murray has told us that faith has to do with the uncharted realm of human experience, that realm where truth is still unascertained or unsystematized, in which our hopes and fears may contrive to live upon themselves, in which the soul stretches forth more or less despairing tentacles into the unknown. One recalls Shelley's *Hymn to Intellectual Beauty:*

"No voice from a sublimer world hath ever
To sage or poet these responses given;
Therefore the names of Demon, Ghost, and Heaven,
Remain the record of their vain endeavour;
Frail spells whose uttered charm might not avail to sever
From all we hear and all we see
Doubt, chance, and mutability."

When Shelley wrote those lines, a hundred years ago, with the echoes of French unbelief ringing in his ear, he felt no doubt at all that the collapse of theism was at hand, that it was a matter of time, and that the time would be short. But his prediction was only one of many, ventured with equal confidence over the centuries; and what we notice now is that they have all turned out false. To the psychologist, looking at religion today nothing is more impressive than the tenacity with which it has held its place.

Thus we have become impatient with the old explanations, explanations which attributed it to the deficiency of unscientific minds. It persists among multitudes, quite as alive as anyone else to the facts of natural law. And there could be no more vicious circle in reasoning than to argue with Professor Haeckel, that the religious mind is, *ipso facto*, shown to be irrational. We must dig deeper into human nature if we are to reach the basis of this phenomenon. One might almost say that it is not theism which is at constant vanishing point; rather of the "refutation" of theism which happens to be at the moment in vogue, one might pronounce "Behold the feet of them that buried thy predecessor are at the door, and they shall carry thee out".

The "naïve reasoning" theory of religion reveals its imperfections from another point of view. There is one way of searching for a common principle in the faiths of the world, a way which has often been tried, but which has never led and never will lead anywhere. If you spread out before you a picture of all the known religions, and if you ask, "Is there any single belief in which they all agree?" you will find none. They do not all include,

for example, a belief in God, or in a future life. There is no intellectual statement which is common to them. But what ever led us to fancy that there might be, or that there should be? Why should we take for granted that religion begins with a set of beliefs? These may not be its essence, they may be its products, its accompaniments; though there should be no single coincidence of an intellectual kind, no point where the creed of one overlaps the creed of another, yet they may be the varied flowering of a single stem. As we search for a principle of unity we may have to go behind the *doctrines* of every faith, back to the stage before definite doctrine was born; what if it should turn out that there we reach the common ground of all? Mr. R. R. Marrett seems to have intended some such view as this in his theory of a pre-Animistic stage—instinctive, emotional,—upon which Animism followed as an intellectual construction. In other words, we must seek the original element, not in the opinions which different religious men have professed, but in the impulse which led them to form opinions on such a matter at all.

Perhaps the best general definition is that of Dr. Warde Fowler: "Religion is the effort to bring oneself into right relation with the Power or Powers behind all that we can see." And it will help to clearness if we use this to say what irreligion is; it is the disregard of anything and everything, save only what the senses can reveal. It may include the belief that no Power lies behind, or that this Power cannot be known; but it must include the temper, the disposition, which treats such Power as that with which man has no serious concern. The Epicurean conception of "gods who dwell at ease" was thus wholly irreligious though it implied a recognition of deities. So too the confession, in one of his many moods, by the late Oscar Wilde:

"The faith which others give to that which is unseen, I give to what one can touch and look at. My gods all dwell in temples made

with hands, and within the circle of actual experience is my creed made perfect and complete."

A thorough embodiment, surely, of the spirit of secularism! Yet for some reason it seems historically proved that this is a spirit which cannot maintain itself for very long. Particular faiths flourish and decay, but they are succeeded by other faiths. Religion was supposed to be dead and done with among the intellectuals of the first century of our era, that century which witnessed the rise of the most powerful religion the world has ever known. It was supposed to be gone for ever in the cultured England of the eighteenth century; yet the moment of its greatest weakness was the prelude to the Wesleyan revival. Can we explain this persistence otherwise than by supposing that it is rooted in the essential part of our nature, not in the intellect, whose moods can vary and whose opinions can change, but in the will that demands an object of worship, as the magnetic needle seeks the pole? Though it is psychologically incorrect to speak of the "religious instinct"—for there is no such single instinct which we can point out—yet we may speak of it as instinctive, for this word suggests the closest analogy to what we mean.

If philosophers have proved anything in the last thirty years they have proved this, that we should greatly restrict the domain of what is called intellect, and greatly extend the scope of those psychic forces with which intellect has little to do. They are the forces which seem to guide us for the most part, and to guide us, on the whole, rightly, throughout life. Forty years ago instincts were spoken of as almost peculiar to the lower animals. Theologians talked of Providence as having cast a special shield over the animal world, as bestowing upon creatures that could not reflect, a kind of clairvoyance by which, without thinking and without planning, they found their food, built their nests, cared for their offspring, avoided the poisonous shrubs and berries, scented

danger from afar. They pointed to the merciful compensation by which the animal was given senses more acute, a physique more robust, powers that come earlier to maturity, than those of rational, calculating man. The human creature, they said, on the other hand, was able to dispense with these blind leading strings; he could rely upon the open-eyed direction of his "intellect".

No real psychologist will speak like that now. For the more we look into things the more do we become convinced that we too are led by instincts of which we are scarcely aware. We now think of man as set down in a world of natural objects, a world full of perplexities, full of dangers, full of fascinating interests. It is his task, for it is the very condition of his life, to adapt himself somehow, to respond in appropriate ways to the circumstances and forces by which he is encompassed. Woe betide him if he had no better equipment for this than the slow and feeble thing which he calls his reason! Woe betide him if he had to wait until he could spell out the meaning of it all by observation, by reflection, by ordered, systematic argument! Very often he must act first, and think afterwards. Long before he had gathered even the first vintage of his reasonings he would have been swept out of existence by those great natural forces which do not stay their course while we are arguing the pros and cons regarding them.

In such instincts which act for us, before we understand their purpose, we have surely a cogent proof that the world has been arranged for man and man for it. There is not a fundamental impulse which may not find the sphere of its fulfilment, none which, if followed in its purity, will lead us to confusion. Most of the things we do from day to day are, in this sense a venture of faith, a venture—as someone has put it—that the universe, if we trust it, will turn out to be "friendly".

But we have needs and impulses which are not merely

physical. Suppose we extend this idea of adaptation into the moral sphere? We have spiritual strivings to which all material satisfaction is but dry husks. Men in every age, in none more than in the present, have fiercely demanded some means by which they may pierce the veil of sense, by which they may make connection with an unseen world. All the creeds, as Carlyle insisted, are but efforts to make this articulate; they are the protests of him who struggles to be a person, and is told that he is a machine. And if he *were* not a person how *could* he thus struggle? Science does not appease, it stimulates the thirst. As Byron said, "the tree of knowledge is not that of life". It was no belief which originated the phenomena called religious; it was the instinctive or emotional tendency which embodied itself in beliefs. Dogmas do not come before, they come after feeling. "God", as S. Augustine said, "has made us for Himself, and our souls are restless till they find rest in Him."

Such restlessness is, under a more or less thin disguise, the active principle in every faith. Man feels a contradiction in his life; on the one side we recognize our kinship with material things; our bodies are subject to physical and chemical law; like the animal we are born, and grow, and decline, and die. But on the other side, above all in conscience,—of which every naturalistic explanation has proved futile—we feel ourselves a class apart from all things, animate or inanimate, that we can see. As Kant put it, man feels himself a denizen of two worlds: the world of Nature fixed in fate, governed by an iron necessity, driven by passion, crushed under mechanical force; and the world of morality, with ideals which win our homage, with lofty purpose, with high endeavour. Just this sense of contradiction begets what S. Augustine called restlessness, what Wordsworth had in mind when he wrote:

> "Thou whose exterior semblance doth belie
> Thy soul's immensity!"

It is this discord between what one is and what in his best moments he would fain be, it is the consciousness of a striving which often fails and yet bids us ever strive anew. Those who feel this most are most dissatisfied with mechanical accounts of the world; it is because they restore this broken harmony that the religious systems have kept their grip upon mankind.

Such grip would, of course, be impossible, for at least some minds, if it were really so that any assured philosophic result had shown the objects of faith to be nonexistent. But the day of dogmatic denial in speculative circles seems to be over. Adherents of obsolescent systems are, indeed, still fighting a sort of rear-guard action for that "scientific view" which the world has outgrown. But our really creative minds today commend theories of the universe which find ample room for a personal God. It is not the opposition of theologians, it is a quite independent philosophical criticism which has antiquated the anti-theistic schools. Bergson has been the herald of a new age, and as to the boasted "finality" of Hegelianism, one sees that the question has now become whether anything of that system can be kept. Our most recent book on the subject bears the suggestive title, *What is living and what is dead in the philosophy of Hegel?*

If then we rest our case on the very lowest ground—a ground far lower than I personally think justified—if we assume that for the objects of faith philosophy has no adequate proof to offer either *pro* or *con*, we are left with the choice on which our decision must be what Ritschl called a "value-judgment": shall we trust, or shall we not trust that instinctive impulse which ever since man has lived has impelled him towards faith in a divine order, which has made him declare with Teufelsdröckh that "A God made this world, and a Demon not"?

There is to my mind one circumstance which should influence us very strongly indeed towards the positive alternative. Within the last generation religious faith

has been proving itself far more intimately bound up than philosophers of an earlier time would have acknowledged, with the moral interests and moral progress of man. This does not, of course, imply that those in whom religious beliefs are apparently strongest must prove to be morally highest. We are too familiar with the individual discords between creed and practice, though we do not always remember that this is a consideration which cuts both ways. But I am struck by the fact that those speculative thinkers who repudiate religion, and at the same time uphold morality, have found themselves in increasing intellectual embarrassment. And their difficulties suggest that the same point of view from which good and evil, right and wrong, fall into sharp opposition is that from which a religious outlook upon life is the natural consequence.

A generation ago it was considered unenlightened to suppose this. And there was force in the reproach, for theologians had spoken rashly, as if good was good simply because an arbitrary divine will enjoined it, and evil was evil on no other ground than that the same will reprobated it. They sometimes went on to develop such a position as that of Paley; it is a melancholy fact that the great Archdeacon, in some passages, seems to urge that one should be honest or truthful simply because he who steals and he who lies will find it a poor bargain in the lake of fire. Against this it became needful to urge that good is an intrinsic quality, and that the genuine conscience is sensitive to it, quite apart from hopes or fears as to what goodness may effect in a future state. But the recoil, as recoils are apt to do, carried philosophy to the opposite extreme. Few things are more pathetic in speculation than the struggle of those naturalistic moralists who try to say two things at once, to deny an objective moral government of the world, and yet to prove a real obligation upon the human conscience. The most clear-sighted among them have realized that they must

go back or go forward. A few of them have elected to go forward, and our time has seen, what hardly any generation saw before, unbelief in God followed by unbelief in moral differences. The world, I think, will not long rest satisfied with that.

Thus the philosopher or the psychologist can survey the panorama of religions, and he can survey it on a vast scale through history, through material remains, through observation of the present. He sees that these phenomena are everywhere persistent, indestructible, proving in every age the futility of intellectual efforts to remove them. He sees that their critics, equally confident for centuries that the axe has at last been laid to the root of the religious tree, have turned out to be hewing down the rationalistic trees erected by one another. He concludes that the outcome of such criticisms is, at the least, to leave the matter where it was before. And as he recalls how intelligence or reasoning is only one of the guides to life, he is impressed by the fact that faith has led the world far more, that it has sustained man's hold upon the moral values, upon the things that matter most of all, and that where faith weakens these values weaken with it. Perhaps he remembers the words of Zophar: "Canst thou by searching find out God?" and the New Testament assurance that heavenly truth is hidden from the wise and prudent, yet revealed unto babes. He feels perhaps with Wordsworth that "truth is ofttimes nearer when we stoop than when we soar". May he not fairly conclude that he in China, and he in Ceylon, and even he in some savage wigwam, is spiritual brother to us all, each intent in his own way upon spelling out the great enigma, and that the spelling is to be judged correct, less in proportion as it solves an intellectual puzzle, than as it heals the broken continuity of the spirit, and resolves the discords of experience?

We have, I trust, got beyond the stage when men

thought of the God and Father of mankind as limiting his gracious guidance to a handful of people in Palestine, and as dooming to outer darkness those who failed to walk in a light that was never given to them. We may say this, without for a moment compromising our sure confidence that Christianity responds in the highest degree to all the soul's deepest impulses, and is, in virtue of this complete effectiveness, to be called "absolute religion". When I think of the matter thus there often rises before my mind a picture of throbbing interest from the old pagan world. The time was early in the second century, the place was the plain of Olympia, the scene was the great festival of Zeus, celebrated every four years in the presence of a gay, pleasure-loving crowd. It was the nation's tournament of sport, that tournament of which S. Paul may have thought when he wrote the words, "Every man that striveth for the mastery is temperate in all things." That Pan-Hellenic gala carried the mind back over well-nigh a thousand years; for it had been founded at a date lost in the mists of antiquity. A thoughtful Greek who stood there on the day of which I speak must have had feelings which were a strange mixture of pathos and of pride. It was the old age of his country, but he might picture her glorious past; and perhaps the noblest symbol of that past was the colossal figure which for five hundred years had adorned the stadium, the towering statue of the Olympian Zeus, carved by the world's greatest sculptor, the masterpiece in which Pheidias had set for all time the model of plastic art. But the days when men believed in Zeus had long since waned, and as that eager sceptical throng jostled one another to catch a glimpse of the runners or the boxers, it is doubtful if more than a very few gave one devotional thought to the majestic figure which symbolized their fathers' God.

The sports were finished, the voice of the herald had just announced the winners, when a strange thing took

place. A rough, unkempt man, with flowing beard and tattered dress, stood up on a stone, and made signs that he would speak to the crowd. His appearance told what he was, one of those wandering missionaries, not of Christianity but of a gospel in some ways not unlike the Christian, a preacher of the Cynic school, who had toured many cities, filled with the thought of a divine mission. His nearest Christian analogue was perhaps S. John the Baptist, for he had spoken everywhere about sin, about repentance, about the vices of luxury, about the call to simpler living, about justice between man and man. He had come to the games in search of an audience, and the Greeks, eager as ever to hear some new thing, flocked around his rude pulpit. The old preacher's name was Dion Chrysostom, and his text was just that colossal figure of Zeus which was in full view from where he stood. Dion believed as little as any sceptic of them all that that statue resembled a real Ruler of gods, and men; but his question was just the question of this paper; what is it in man which makes him in every land and in every type of culture, think religiously?

The answer of that old saint of paganism was one which would not have misbecome the lips of a Christian apostle. Man, he exclaims, is like a little child, torn from a parent's embrace, yet groping in the darkness for the protecting arm that he has lost. He sees as in a dream the divine form that is hidden from sense; his religious longing is the homeward impulse of the soul. It is true that no figure carved in bronze or in marble can be a fitting likeness of Him Whom eye cannot see. But man in his feebleness must make use of such symbols as come to his hand; the forms of his symbolism differ; one race cannot understand the language of another's devotion; some rude design in wood or metal may be the sacred emblem of a simple folk, while to Pheidias divinity was best revealed under the form of ideal manhood. But where all are but infants crying in the night let none despise

another's plaintive voice; rather let all men join in the great brotherhood of souls, let all make their way by different paths to the one great Mystery. For the spirit which underlies any faith is that which is life-giving in them all.

I think we have still much to learn from that old Cynic. In particular, as the sects of Christendom have fought over their creeds, have they not thought too much about faith's outward expression, and too little about its inward impulse? That which should have been the closest bond of union has been turned into a barrier of estrangement We may be thankful that the note of controversy is not so strident as it once was, we rely less than our ancestors did upon arguing one another into acceptance of our own version of Christianity. Even if we are sure, as of course we all are, that our own light is the strongest, we should remember that He Who set the sun in the heavens made the stars also. "As if", cried Russell Lowell,

> "As if the Shepherd Who from outer cold
> Leads all his shivering lambs to one sure fold,
> Were careful for the fashion of his crook!"

"Depend upon it", said James Martineau, "unity lies in profounder strata of our nature than any mere tillage of the intellect can reach. We realize it only as we see that at different tables we have eaten of the same spiritual meat, and touched our lips with the same wine of remembrance."

French Literature During The War

By J. Calvet,
Fellow of the University, Professor in the Collège Stanislas, Paris.

Literature is an art of peace. Its purpose is to embellish life. But since 1914 the French—writers as well as workers—have been occupied in defending life, and this sacred necessity has surpassed everything else. Then, too, during the first months of the war, literature was silent, leaving the word to the soldiers. Later, it understood how it could adapt its art to war and how it could make of literary work an instrument of combat and of victory. It took up the pen once more. Literary production has been so abundant that it has been possible to organize, at Lyons, a book market where more than a thousand works have been exhibited which are a brilliant proof of the vitality of the French spirit.

At the moment when war was declared we were on the eve of a literary renaissance; one felt that a certain effervescence of youth was at hand, and this was already affirmed by some works which were more than promises. This artistic awakening was one of the manifold manifestations of the new France, a France at once conscious of her past and of her future, of her obligations to the world—a France become herself again.

The young writers attempted to lose nothing of the treasure of their complex traditions and to canalize the diverse aspirations of their contemporaries. Intellectual anarchy had had its time and proved its impotence.

They revived the idea of discipline in art as in life. People were weary of revolving deceptive pessimisms and bitter despairs. They resuscitated the pride of being a Frenchman, the dignity of being a man? master of his destiny. Literary formulas of preceding generations—that of the Symbolists and that of the Realists—seemed to them insufficient. The Symbolists believed that art was able to live in a region of dreams which the imagination peopled with phantoms, forgetting that human art cannot create its own substance and that it must, in order to live, first accept reality. The Realists believed that art should be subservient to its object, that it should lose itself in reality and confine itself to reproducing reality by words and lines, forgetting that art is active, or it does not exist; that it is a creator; that is to say, that it frees from their prison of matter the ideas enclosed within the substance of things. The young masters of the new school were revising the two formulas in order to reconcile them—realism and mysticism, the concrete and the abstract—in a synthesis which must be the truth in art since it is the truth in life. It was not possible to give a name to their attempt because the realization of it was still incomplete when the war brusquely arrested it: I imagine that the literary period which was commencing might be called *Mystic Realism.*

Some would be inclined to say *Catholic Realism.* And that name would suit perfectly the group of the new school that is most alive, most generous and most highly endowed, the group which has already asserted itself in masters like Paul Claudel, Francis Jammes, Charles Péguy, Ernest Psichari. These looked at life and knew how to see it with precision, but they recognized the meaning in it, and that it is prolonged most beautifully and most richly in infinity; they maintained that this supernatural prolongation of the spiritual life is of the domain of art, that it is the very chosen substance of it, the marble of the greatest purity.

None of these young writers consented to enter the sanctuary as believers; some, with Barrès, their master, contented themselves with admiring the soaring of the belfry towards the heavens in a country purified by the spiritual element; others, still less affirmative, took refuge in a sort of naturalistic pantheism. But all of them claimed to adhere to reality; all of them affirmed mystery; all of them believed in life, in disciplined action, in the harmonious future.

Every formula which does not prove its efficacy in reality, that is to say, in sorrow, is but a vain assemblage of words. Our young writers have had this chance since circumstances have permitted them to put to the proof their love of discipline and of action; at an age when first poems are written they departed for the field of battle. As one of the most determined of their group has said, they knew their destiny; they understood that they were a generation sacrificed—"sacrificed, which means that from the very beginning it accepted this sacrifice to which it felt itself predestined. A generation sacrificed, yes, for the grandeur of France and for human liberty; sacrificed because there are no just conquests but those that are engrafted on sacrifice".[1]

They departed, and their souls have been widened again by contact with epic reality. They exalted their will above even difficult undertakings; they accepted with joy the approaching sacrifice; then, like the chevaliers, they were conscious of struggling for the beauty of the world; fighting for their native land, they saw with greater clearness the enchanted visage. They were in that which is called "*l'état de grâce esthétique*", a moment very rare in the life of the artist. That which they have written there, face to face with the enemy in the trenches, ought to be beautiful with an enduring beauty. Notebooks, letters, meditations, poems penciled between two

[1]Henri Massis: *Impressions de guerre* (Crès edit.).

battles—of all these we know only fragments. How shall we judge these breathless bits, full of the majesty of death? The future will tell what of them ought to remain. The authors have fallen, their work unfinished but transfigured suddenly by their sacrifice; for the moment we see nothing but the light which death throws upon the pages of their books or upon the leaves of their manuscripts. Emile Clermont, who was killed by the enemy, wrote in his notebook, on hearing of the death of Péguy:

"Transformed on the day of his death. A final period for his work, suddenly completed, detached from things terrestrial, accomplished, signed; a sealed, living, achieved whole."

And, thinking of Péguy, of Clermont, and of all the others, one of their youthful admirers wrote in a letter which death must have prevented him from finishing:

"These writers believed in putting the best of themselves in their works; they deceived themselves gloriously by showing in their deaths that they had reserved something still more pure for their country."

No, truly, criticism has not the right to judge these fragments splashed with blood, the last expression of souls so exalted. It is of more avail to count the deaths. There are more than a hundred who were already, or who would become, illustrious: Péguy, Psichari, Clermont, du Roure, Lionel des Rieux, Drouet, Lafon, Masson, Drouot, Nolly, Laurentie, Perrot, Despax, Cassagnac, Max Doumic, Paul Acker, Maurice Deroure.[2]

How many others who were promised to literary glory have given their blood joyously for the liberty of their country? They would not wish to be wept for; they would prefer that we should recite for them that admirable invocation which Péguy wrote a short time before his death:

[2] Henri Bordeaux has written a beautiful book on the three writers last named: *Trois Tombes* (Plon, edit.). M. Carlos Larronde publishes an anthology of writers who have died for their country (Larousse, edit.).

Heureux ceux qui sont morts pour la terre charnelle,
Mais pourvu que ce fut dans une juste guerre.
Heureux ceux qui sont morts pour quatre coins de terre.
Heureux ceux qui sont morts d'une mort solennelle.
Heureux ceux qui sont morts dans les grandes batailles
Couchés dessus le sol à la face de Dieu.
Heureux ceux qui sont morts sur un dernier haut lieu
Parmi tout l'appareil des grandes funerailles.
Heureux ceux qui sont morts dans une juste guerre.

There have been published some posthumous works by these dead heroes which they had had leisure to complete and which consequently it is fitting to criticise. These works were not born of the war, and yet they already bear in themselves its imprint; they are written by soldiers all alert, who have heard the call of the bugle. The two most important, which stand out and which will survive, are *Le Conquérant*, by Emile Nolly,[3] and the *Voyage du Centurion*, by Ernest Psichari.[4]

The theme of the *Conquérant* is most simple. We are at Casablanca, where the Jews freed by us from the Mussulman yoke and the camp followers of all nations flocking after our army, have set up their hideous traffic. The Comte de Chadeuil, a nobleman, ruined and almost dishonoured, arrives here to rebuild his fortune by labour and by speculation. He very soon becomes the prey of the sharpers; he falls low, even to robbery. But the tradition of French honour sets him right; he enlists, and he goes to find death on the battlefield. This study of a soul, which founders and then escapes from shame by sacrifice, is drawn with skill and vigour. The principal merit of the book, however, is not in this. The novel arouses the imagination; it puts before our eyes the real Moroccan with his crude colours, his shallows, his faults and his glories. Because he is sincere he is compelled to meditate. The officer who observes all things intensely sees that the civilization brought by our arms carries in its train a procession of ugly things. For a moment he doubts, he hesitates, he asks himself

[3] Calmann Lévy edit. [4] Conard edit.

if it is worth the trouble to open the way for this rottenness. Then he understands that civilization, being liberty, unlooses the forces alike of good and evil, and thus opens the field for the great combat between vice and virtue—the eternal honour of the free man. The shop of the Jew who haggles, the hovel, the dive are the necessary reverse of the school, the highway, the railroad; the wooden town, city of traders, of undesirables, refugees from justice, raises the roofs of its huts beside the tents of the camp where the soldiers of France rest from their victories. Emile Nolly sees this hideous canker and with the pessimistic precision of a Stendhal he describes it. But he is not arrested by this desolate horizon. The officer who struggles with the Zaïan rebels has forgotten all the shame of Casablanca; he thinks of France, the humane, who arms her soldiers only to liberate peoples, and, in confiding to them the sword which kills, imposes upon them the countersign of justice and of benevolence.

The grandeur of the Moroccan battlefield washes away the dishonour with which the Wooden Town has stained the soil of Casablanca. The *Conquérant* is a book as bitter and as consoling as the *Servitude et Grandeu, Militaire* of Alfred de Vigny. Stendhal, Vigny—it is nor by chance that these names are evoked. Like the formert the writers of today have the acute sense of reality, and like the latter, the faculty of uncovering the ideas that are hidden beneath realities; they are at once realists and mystics.

The mystic faculty predominates in the *Voyage du Centurion.* Even the title is symbolic. It recalls the Centurion of the Gospel who is presented to us as the incarnation of discipline; he obeys and he commands, he does not question and he is not to be questioned. Disciplined as a true soldier, he will know how to be obedient to truth when it shall be presented to him, and, after a long journey through

revolt and through error, he bows himself as a child before the Master.

Psichari presents his hero, Maxence, as a young, unbelieving officer who has sought to find happiness in life through pleasure. He has found nothing but deep sadness because he has an innate desire and need for truth. He is irritated by the social deceit which surrounds him, by the vain tumult which deafens him; and when he obtains the command of a column which must work and live in the desert for many months, he is happy to escape from a hypocritical society, and to give himself up to solitude. In the first days solitude works in him the expected transformation; it effaces in him the remembrance of deceit and fallacy and puts him in contact with the absolute. He is able to think—which he has not done for years—to rise above the seeming and to meet God.

A soldier, he has gone with an order which he is to execute; in the course of his journey he will receive other orders, and he will obey blindly. The responsible leader of a troup on the march, he must give each morning instructions which are decisive, and he must command as a master. His eyes are opened to the necessity for discipline. But in life everything holds together; it is impossible to accept military discipline and to reject moral discipline: he who accepts the Sword must accept the Cross. Then he institutes order within himself: he subdues his flesh to his spirit and thus prepares the domain of his soul for the reign of God.

He journeys across the desert. The austere lines of the rocks and the barren sands preach to him the necessity of law and of sorrow. He puts himself to school to nature, which he had not before regarded face to face, and he discovers that it has been created to instruct us in our duties. He journeys across the desert and his soul journeys through error. Sometimes there are burning sands; sometimes there are oases where one abandons

oneself to the joys of sense; wells of fresh water where one drinks deep. Maxence dreams and meditates. The changing landscape is unrolled to eyes which hardly see it, being occupied with the inner pictures which are unveiled to the soul in its travels. He encounters bright phantoms resembling angels and he enacts again the combat of Jacob. He recalls Dante, Pascal and the Gospel. From the outside world come few incidents capable of modifying his inner life. He receives news from France; then he remembers that in these distant countries he represents France, and when he seeks to understand the meaning of those words, *to represent France*, when he sets himself to discover the exact attitude in which the Mussulman will see in reality the majesty of France, he is compelled to admit that he cannot declare France before Islam except he declare himself a Catholic. He recalls certain words because his soul, renewed, purified by the solitude, lends itself better to their remembrance. One evening, facing the desert set on fire by the setting sun, a thoughtful Moor embracing the horizon in a large gesture, says to him, "Allah is great!" Maxence has a sudden revelation of the immensity of God. When he tries to make his companion admire the grandeur of France which transforms Africa, the Moor answers: "Yes, you have the kingdom of earth, but we have the kingdom of Heaven!" and Maxence understands in that hour the dignity of the spiritual element, the vast superiority of "grace" over "nature", of "charity" over "force". God attracts him but Maxence does not dare to go to God. Finally he discovers the "Mediator" and he understands that all will be simple. His soul has ended its voyage and he with a full heart recites the "Pater".

The setting of this spiritual pilgrimage, the desert, is described with impressive power. How can one paint a vague, flat, monotonous landscape? The rhetorical methods of description are here useless and Psichari

does not attempt to employ them. He is saturated with the desert and he saturates his reader with it. It is impossible to tell on what particular page he describes it, but when one closes the book one sees the Sahara, and feels, as it were, its oppressive glare. What is most striking in these landscapes is the continual union of the concrete with the abstract, of the visible object, in its line and colour, with the idea concealed within it. The straight rock of the mountain expresses will, the exact line of the stones indicate discipline and law. Thought hovers constantly in the vibrating light, in the oppressive air, in the burning sands, in the night breezes. Psichari is always, and with equal intensity, a man of action and a man of dreams, a realist and a mystic. His book is the most complete of all those which Mystic Realism has produced when it approaches the Catholic affirmation, and I should not be surprised to see a generation of writers regarding this work as a source of inspiration and drawing from it lessons for art and for life.

The *Voyage du Centurion*, following the *Appel des Armes*, aroused great interest in France, because the author, Ernest Psichari, is the grandson of Renan, and people desired to see in his life of a soldier, in his Catholic affirmations, in his profoundly religious books, a contradiction, as it were, of the thought and acts of his grandfather, and a reparation. This was a very superficial judgment. In reality, Psichari resembles Renan, but he belongs to a generation which has measured the abyss into which the dilettantism of their grandfathers and the individualism of their fathers plunged France. He has reacted, become again a good Frenchman. Like Renan, he would have found it pleasant to abandon himself to the weakness of scepticism and to juggle with the most exalted ideas, but he did not allow himself to do so. By an effort, meritorious and difficult, he imposed upon himself discipline, rule, faith, which possibly were repugnant to him. He preserved all the grace of his grand-

father. The severity of his doctrine is rounded and softened in the mellow harmony of his phrasing. He is a Renan in whom experience, necessity and reason have decided to thwart his own nature for good.

The books written by the combatants between two battles or while wounded have neither the weight nor the importance of the *Conquérant* or of the *Voyage du Centurion*. It is possible for a work of art to be conceived in the tumult of war but it can be completed only in calm days. The impressions of the combatants are revelations of the soul of the army, of its courage, of its spirit. Jotted down by the way, at the hazard of circumstance and of humour, chosen without reflection, and without recoil, they will be effaced in order to make room for the stronger writing which the combatants will do when they are able to relive the violent epic, at a distance and in the silence of meditation.

The *Récits de Combattants*,[5] gathered by Baron Baffin is a collection of the verbal orders of officers who give minute accounts of activities of which they were in charge. In itself the *genre* has nothing of art, but it is so rich in realism that the very nakedness of its precision has a poignant eloquence. Henri d'Estre, in his journal, *D'Oran à Arras*,[6] recounts the impressions of a young African officer who hastened joyously to the war and then tasted all its bitterness, all its deadly cruelty. In *Étapes et Combats*,[7] by Christian Malet, we find the breathless tale of that marvellous cavalry raid which marked the first hours of the war. A regiment of dragoons, having left Rheims to go to the aid of invaded Belgium, arrives at Liège after some days; retreats, fighting, to Versailles; rushes headlong into the battle of the Marne, passes the enemy's lines, becomes confused and entangled in the fleeing German regiments; always fighting, loses three-fourths of its men and finally gathers

[5] Plon edit. [6] Plon edit. [7] Plon edit.

the glorious débris in order to turn them over to an infantry regiment—all this at a stretch, in one breath, without halting, without thinking, in a kind of epic dream.

The collection made by Léonce de Grandmaison, *Impressions de guerre de prêtres soldats*,[8] and that made by Victor Bucaille, *Lettres de prêtres aux armées*[9] have a totally different character. Here we are in the presence of soldiers dominated by the spiritual ideal. They take up the musket and they kill because they must, but above the carnage of the battle they place the charity which saves and comforts. Their stories are simple and moving. Without attempting to do so, simply because they tell of their ministry as priests rather than of their exploits as soldiers, they bring out the most striking characteristic of this war, which is at once the most barbarous that the world has ever seen and, in a sense, the most spiritual, since there has never before been seen such an exaltation of souls, such a realization of sacrifice and of its religious meaning, and such an acceptation of death in defense of justice.

The most vivid of these accounts of the war is that of Marcel Dupont, *En Campagne*.[10] This young officer *de légère* is a new comer in literature, but he is a born writer. He knows how to look at details and at events as a whole, to see their colouring and their significant lines. He is at once tender and gay, without vain sentimentality and without boastfulness. His style has a smiling lightness which awakens interest and hurries one along. The pages where he presents Sister Gabrielle, so tender with the hungry, sleepy soldiers; the chapter where he tells of Christmas Eve in the trenches—the religious songs sung by the Germans in their shelters while our soldiers listen pensively, in a kind of sacred truce—will survive as a masterpiece of charm and emotion.

[8] Plon edit. [9] Payot edit. [10] Plon edit.

Lieutenant R ——[11] tells little; he meditates. He has been told that this war will free his country, but he has thought that it ought to serve as a means for uplifting his personality—how can action be sublime unless it be the source of moral progress? Then, in the trenches, he dreams, he cultivates his ego, like a Vauvenargues, like a Vigny, with absolute sincerity, face to face with himself, with life, and with death. The pages which he has written are clear-cut, pure in design, complete—the words chosen without affectation but slowly and carefully. Lieutenant R —— is master of his nerves in the face of death and he is master of his tongue. He recounts little, but he thinks and he stimulates thought.

If solitary meditation is favourable for the production of a work of art, what masterpieces will be brought to us from captivity by those of our prisoners who know how to observe, reflect and write! May the sadness at least fail to crush the energies of their souls, and may the narcotic of physical suffering fail to stupefy their minds! Already prisons are yawning, and some privileged persons, the severely wounded, the hospital attendants, have returned. Certain of these have written their memoirs: Abbé Aubry, *Ma Captivité en Allemagne*;[12] André Warnod, *Prisonnier de guerre*,[13] and we have read them with interest and emotion. They come from a city of sorrow and they raise a corner of the thick veil which hides it from our eyes. But the prison has given us something more than interesting memoirs. I would refer to a masterly book which holds the attention and which will survive—the *Journal d'un simple soldat*[14] by Gaston Riou. The author is well known: very independent in thought and manner, nevertheless in his most profound tendencies he belongs to the new school and many recognize in him a leader. While youth and maturity are in the combat, old age

[11] Lieutenant R ——: *Méditations dans la tranchée* (Payot).
[12] Perrin edit. [13] Fasquelle edit. [14] Hachette edit.

has remained behind, as a witness of the war. For these witnesses there has been strong agitation. They have seen unusual events break in upon the monotony of their lives and change from hour to hour. They have seen epic departures; they have lived through hours of agony; they have trembled with joy and hope, and the newspapers have inflamed them with heroic recitals. Many have believed themselves artists: the material was at hand, rare material such as is not often met with in the course of centuries; their hearts beat strongly and felt the hour of election. They have seized the pen and they have written—moving tales, surely, since each struggles to tell why and how he loves France? But is this art? How many of these premature books will live after the war? To produce a great work, a rare subject and a generous heart will not suffice; it is necessary to have the gift of expression, and this gift is rare.

Young women who know how to write and sedentary people who read have quite naturally been tempted to set down events from today, first for themselves, and then, as the notebook is filled and takes on form, for their friends, and finally—why not?—for the public. Thus diaries of the war have been born, of which the *Journal d'une famille pendant la guerre*, by Maïten d'Arguibert,[15] or, indeed, the *Journal d'une mère pendant la guerre*, by Madame Ed. Drumont,[16] are typical examples. These are moving books, captivating, even; but the interest is a trifle limited. More extended and more significant is the *Journal d'un Curé de Campagne pendant la guerre*, by Jean Quercy.[17] Here we may see the rôle played by the curé in the mobilization of the country's moral forces; here again we find a document—and documents of this *genre* are very unusual—setting forth the life of country families during the crisis and showing their strength of soul. The tale is moving but truthful and impressive in its simplicity.

[15] Perrin edit. [16] Attinger edit. [17] Beauchesne edit.

Some of these witnesses behind the scenes have observed the war most closely in the hospitals and they have noted down the spectacle of pain and of heroism which they have seen. Mme. Eydoux Démians in the *Notes d'une Infirmière*[18] describes with skill and with restrained emotion a new feeling which has been born of the war, that spiritual motherhood which is developed in the heart of woman at the bedside of the wounded. She becomes for them the very symbol of their mother country and at the same time a real mother who takes the place of the one who is absent. Abbé Félix Klein, chaplain of the American Ambulance, at Neuilly tells of *La guerre vue d'une ambulance.*[19] His exquisite art as an observer and the natural distinction of his language have been recognized, and these qualities give a peculiar charm to his diary. It was well, moreover, that our gratitude for the tender generosity of Americans towards our wounded was given distinction by the author of so many excellent works about America.

The usual chroniclers of Parisian life have continued their observations and their narratives during the war; and as they are the greatest writers of our literature, or are not far from it, their daily articles, collected in volumes, invite attention. How comes it that they do not hold it for long? It is because history walks with the stride of a giant; each day brings us a new reality, poignant or glorious, that effaces that of the night before. The agitated discussions of the events of yesterday seem useless to us; the counsels which we were given are no longer in season; that which was hoped for did not happen; that which was not expected has come to pass. Knowledge has changed the incidence, or rather we do not look at the war any more with the same eyes. When the plague shall have passed we will read attentively the chronicles of 1914 in order to relive the first days of the tempest; we have no leisure for that today, occupied as

[18] Plon edit. [19] Colin edit.

we are in living the war as it is renewed each day and in anticipating its events in our feverish impatience. This is a pity. The daily chronicles, collected during a period of six months or a year, have a very great literary interest. They show up badly the history which is confused and contradictory, but they reveal the soul of the chronicler. Henri Lavedan[20] here appears lively and moving, less forbearing and more vigorous than in times of peace. Albert de Mun, whom the sorrows of his country have killed, is exalted above himself and gives here the best of his Christian knightly soul. Francis Charmes[21] preserves the austere simplicity and the slightly studied hauteur of an academician and senator in judging the violent events which agitate without astonishing him. Jean Richepin,[22] lyric poet by vocation, is excited to enthusiasm, proclaims his confidence, and finds again all the ferocity of his vagrant speech in order to abuse the enemy; Fernand Laudet,[23] forbearing and optimistic, admires and felicitates Paris for having been Paris. Victor Giraud,[24] with carefully chosen words and well turned phrases, celebrates the miracle of French unity and resolution, and sets himself to indicate what our literature will be after the war. Marcel Boulenger,[25] in pretty phrases a little faded and languid, distils drop by drop the anguished sorrow of the soldier who must leave his beloved home and the roses of his garden. Remy de Gourmont,[26] disturbed by the war in his pacifist dream and in his irony, forces himself to maintain his mental equilibrium and to translate into impartial words an emotion which he does not excessively desire. Romain Rolland,[27] desiring to conserve all his admirers on both sides of the Rhine, treats the war as a symphony, before

[20] *Les Grandes Heures* (Perrin). [21] *La Guerre* (Perrin).
[22] *Proses de Guerre* (Flammarion).
[23] *Paris pendant la guerre* (Perrin).
[24] *Le miracle français* (Hachette). [25] *Le Coeur au Loin* (Crès).
[26] *Dans la Tourmente* (Crès); *Pendant l'Orage* (Champion).
[27] *Au dessus de la Mêlée* (Ollendorf).

judging which it is necessary to listen from above, and in retirement upon his Swiss rock, beyond and above the tumult, he distributes praise and blame to both camps, with a cold intelligence and an unfeeling heart, of which he is proud and of which no one is envious. But the most astonishing of all the chroniclers is Maurice Barrés.[28] On every day since the war began he has written his article; that is to say, he makes his daily fight and stands at his post like a soldier. He preaches to civilians concord and the spirit of sacrifice which alone make them worthy of the combatants; he exalts the grandeur of the soldier, the beauty of the mutilated; he honours the young writers who have died for their country; he seeks for the moral significance of frightful things and is pre-occupied with showing that the spiritual element dominates in this war; faithful to his mission as a great artist, he sets himself to weave with words quivering with emotion a veil of beauty over the charnel-house. Assuredly this rapid work is unequal and sometimes hesitating, but it is great in the intensity of its patriotic fire, in the sumptuousness of its sentiments and its words; and in order to make its whole tendency felt most adequately, it may only be said that if it were lacking, there would be lacking from this war a considerable part of that which makes for its spiritual grandeur. If Maurice Barrés were not here, we would less surely perceive that our soldiers are fighting for humanity and for beauty.

The daily commentaries clear up certain aspects of the war or concentrate attention on secondary episodes which thus take an excessive fulness. History alone is able to set incidents in their proper places, to indicate consequences and veritable meanings, but the history of the war will not be possible until the day when the generals' order-books, the reports of the staff officers, the notes of the diplomats shall become a part of the archives

[28] *L'Union Sacrée—Les saints de France* (Emile Paul).

and accessible to the writer. The documents which in the meantime are at our command do not have scientific value, and the most ingenious are perhaps the most false. The historian, then, must limit himself to recording the facts as they may appear to him in the chronological tables which have no literary characteristics but which will serve as the basis for future history.

I cannot mention all the historians who, unable to tell of the present war, have devoted themselves to problems connected with it,[29] or rather, turning to the past, have sought there for situations similar to ours and for lessons for our time.[30] But it is necessary to guard oneself from neglecting the essay of Dr. Gustave Le Bon: *Enseignements psychologiques de la Guerre européenne.*[31] It is recognized that the methods which he has applied to the study of the evolution of peoples and of the psychology of crowds are sometimes very vague, sometimes a little hasty. With the same methods he handles today the problem of the war and he attempts to penetrate the souls of the nations and the souls of their leaders in order to determine the motives which have led them into the conflict and still guide them today in their action. To the question, Who desired this war? his method compels him to answer: No one.

This question, Who desired the war? is in truth quite vain. War was inevitable. The conflict must burst forth one day or another, because psychic forces rule the world and guide it in spite of our wills. It is necessary to meditate upon this declaration of Dr. Le Bon and upon others; even when he is not of our opinion, it is recognized that he is always impartial and clear-sighted. Dr. Le Bon's conclusions, moreover, impress

[29] Auguste Gauvain: *Les Origines de la guerre européenne* (Colin); Balcanicus: *La Bulgarie, ses ambitions, sa trahison* (Colin); Gabriel Faure: *Paysages de guerre, champs de bataille de France et d'Italie* (Perrin).

[30] Marcel Poëte: *Paris devant la menace étrangère en 1636* (Perrin); General Canonge: *Histoire de l'invasion allemande en 1870* (Perrin).

[31] Flammarion edit.

one as those of a historian rather than of an incontestable master. Jacques Bainville, studying the simple succession of facts, tends toward exactly the same point. His book, *Histoire de deux peuples, La France et l'Empire allemand*[32], has something decisive in its brevity; it imposes in the name of literature a kind of law: France has by reason of tradition a difficult rôle to fulfil, to arrest the overflow of Germany along the Rhine and to preserve from her domination the Latin world and humanity.

The writers, narrators and novelists, who have found literary material in the war are numerous: mingling the shreds of reality which they know with the probable fictions which they imagine, they construct moving or cruel tales which preserve the feeling of the war and are founded upon the war. Léon Frapié,[33] savory and unfeeling, René Bazin,[34] dull and tender, Paul d'Ivoi,[35] bombastic and cruel, distinguish themselves in the new warfare. It has even been attempted—this is indeed a French custom —to utilize the heroic recital in order to arouse the imagination of the children and to form their civic consciousness.[36]

The novelists will for a long time, it is certain, exploit the war, taking from it subjects for their novels, brilliant episodes, or a framework of horror and heroism which sets in relief tender sentiments. At the present hour, of the already considerable number of works which have been born of this inspiration, I have seen but four which count and which demand examination: *La Veillée des Armes*, by Marcelle Tynayre,[37] *Le Sens de la Mort*, by Paul Bourget,[38] *l'Adjudant Benoît*, by Marcel Prévost,[39] *Gaspard*, by René Benjamin.[40]

---

[32] *Nouvelle Librairie Nationale.* [33] *Contes de Guerre* (Flammarion).
[34] *Récits du temps de la Guerre* (Calmann Lévy).
[35] *Femmes et Gosses héroïques* (Flammarion).
[36] *L'Heroïsme Français par Un Français* (Hatier); cf. Paul Souchon: *Les mots héroïques de la guerre* (Larousse).
[37] Calmann Lévy edit. [38] Plon edit. [39] Lemerre edit. [40] Fayard edit.

La Veillée des Armes is the slightest but not the least moving. It is made of nothing. Like a proper classic tragedy, it recounts the events which take place within twenty-four hours, a day and a night—the day of mobilization, the night which precedes the departure of the mobilized army. Unrest has for a week slowly penetrated the heart; on Saturday, without knowing why, without the news being any more decisive, vague feelings provoke words which one is astonished to hear and movements which the reason considers absurd. At the same time, patriotism, awakened and strengthened, disciplines tongues and hearts, and puts fire into eyes. Marcelle Tynayre excels in seizing the diverse manifestations of a common state of mind. With an application a trifle forced, in order to sum up all France, or at least all Paris, he makes pass before our eyes labourers, shop-keepers, charwomen, careless artists, timid great ladies, officers, enthusiastic youths, worldly revellers, pacifist intellectuals. These personages appear like marionettes, remaining on the scene just long enough to say a word, to make a characteristic gesture, then disappearing. But the word and the gesture are of a striking appropriateness—it is the triumph of spontaneity. And this procession is enveloped in an atmosphere of tenderness, that tenderness, at once ingenuous and sensual in which all the novels of Marcelle Tynayre languish. War is the separation of lovers, and the vigil of arms gives to their love a strange violence. If afterwards it happens that in spite of the ties of the flesh which unite them, they both accept the separation —the man with an ardent soul already filled with the breath of battles, the woman with a heart bruised but resigned—their love will thus be spiritualized, and above their broken lives will appear most luminously the image of a country which commands and which makes easy anguish such as this. This is the thought which lightens the last pages of the *Veillée des Armes*, and which makes a work of art out of a simple notebook.

The novel by Paul Bourget, *Le Sens de la Mort*, has been much discussed. As it puts openly a moral question, one forgets the development of the romantic theme in order to apply oneself wholly to the problem. The French have always been more interested in matters of conscience than in those of aesthetics, and nothing impassions them so much as casuistry. It would, however, be just to notice with what art Bourget, who has the dramatic sense, has guided his novel. By easy stages he leads all his characters to a clinic of the famous surgeon, Ortègue: the surgeon himself, a combative positivist, his wife, Marguerite, whom he has converted to his ideas, his wife's cousin, Le Gallic, a Breton officer, who believes in God and who fights with all his soul, Doctor Marsal, a dramatic utility, who listens and replies and makes the connecting link between the three principal characters. Le Gallic is wounded and is about to die. He loves God enough to be able to bear the pain, to sacrifice his life, which he knows is failing, and his profound and secret love for Marguerite. Ortègue is stricken with cancer and knows that he is dying, but as he thinks that all is ended with death, he considers it useless to bear the pain, and he is about to kill himself. More than this, a lover even until death and jealous of Le Gallic whose feelings he has divined, he will involve his wife in the suicide, and he makes her promise to die with him. The dénouement is rapid and brutal. The two rivals confront one another —Ortègue, violent and excited, Le Gallic, master of himself. Then they die—Ortègue poisons himself and Le Gallic gives himself up to God, having dragged from Marguerite the promise that she will survive her husband. The drama is clean-cut, compact, poignant, and I do not believe that Bourget in any other book has attained an equal power of concentration.

Paul Bourget does not leave to the reader the effort to formulate the moral question which springs of itself out of the contrast between the two deaths, that of Ortègue

and that of Le Gallic. He sets it forth and discusses it himself, and he ends his novel with a moralist's dissertation. A disciple of William James, he appreciates a doctrine in accordance with its practical value. Of the two systems—that of Le Gallic who believes in God and who accepts pain and death in order to make reparation for his faults and the faults of others, and that of Ortègue who believes in nothing but matter and denies to pain and death all signification; the first aided in vanquishing pain and death by joyous hope; the second driven to despair, to narcotics, to suicide—the first can be utilized, the second is useless, and this creates in favour of the first a presumption of truth.

Then enlarging the question and considering the murderous war, the moralist adds: if the affirmation of Ortègue is true, if death has no meaning, then battles are nothing but a monstrous and brutal butchery; if Le Gallic is right, if death is a sacrifice which God witnesses and which He accepts, a consoling thought hovers above the destruction, and we may look for a better world to emerge from the scourge of war. For the honour of humanity it is necessary that Le Gallic be right. It is possible to resist Bourget's arguments, but one cannot dodge the problem which he offers for our reflection; it is to the honour of the novelist that he has known how to extract from the war the essential question, and, since the war has destruction for its aim, to have asked of himself what is the meaning of death.

It is a moral problem also, a case of conscience which is offered by Marcel Prévost's novel, *l'Adjudant Benoit.* Prévost puts in the scene a modest adjutant who tells the story himself. This soldier is quite Latin. Instead of wholly abandoning himself to the business and routine of military affairs, he remains a man in the midst of the war, a man tender and scrupulous. Adjutant Benoit, on the eve of the war, is a telephone operator at the Luxembourg frontier, near Fort Cissy in the Chateau

d'Uffigny. The chateau is inhabited only by the keeper, Archer, his daughter Gertrude, and their servant. Archer is a patriot; he surrounds Benoit with every kindness; he makes friends with him in his pavilion; Gertrude smiles upon him; he falls in love with her. But he redoubles his attention during the first days of the war and he discovers that the Chateau d'Uffigny is communicating with the enemy. He suspects Archer's servant of treason because he dares not suspect the father of her whom he now loves with ever greater ardour and who must one day be his wife. In the course of a night spent in the forest he finds the real traitor. It is Archer. Benoit will have to deliver him to his chiefs. But Archer is the father of Gertrude who knows nothing of all this. Benoit makes discipline give way; he will liberate Archer provided that he goes beyond the frontier. It is then that Archer has the audacity to assault him and wound him. Benoit defends himself; he kills and abandons the traitor in a ravine. After the murder he ought to turn from Gertrude: but Gertrude knows nothing; he pities this ingenuous child upon whom shame and sorrow weighs so heavily. He allows himself to be carried away; she becomes his. And then at once he must go away. Fort Cissy has been taken without a struggle; the enemy comes; the garrison at d'Uffigny retreats; during a halt, in the depths of a wood, it is overwhelmed by the German artillery; Gertrude dies at the foot of an oak tree, demanding from Benoit that he seek for Archer whom she has not seen again and about whom she is troubled. Benoit has committed two sins: he has sinned against discipline in attempting to shield Archer from military justice; he has sinned against natural law in taking the daughter of the man whom he has killed. For these two sins, which he has committed through weakness and love, the soldier cannot pardon himself. He will throw himself into the conflict and he will die in order to forget and to expiate.

Prévost's novel lacks amplitude. Its characters are

isolated in the midst of the great war and they are connected with it only by a slender thread. Following the Stendhalian formula, so dear to our writers today, the action is concentrated within the area of a few square feet and we are shown nothing that the personages of the novel could not see. But if inspiration is lacking in this picture of the war, the analysis of souls, the dissection of consciences indicates a scrupulous attention and an exacting care as great as if the safety of the country were dependent upon a verbal elucidation of feelings. These minute details are set forth in language that is sober, roughly defined, the language of a soldier who has forgotten the languid movements, the enervating graces, which it sometimes assumes in boudoirs or in giving advice to Françoise.

There is a double current in the French genius—the Latin current, which leads us to the study of universal ideas, and the Gallic current, which brings us back to our popular origins. The Gallic spirit is that faculty in life of adapting oneself to all circumstances, even the most difficult, seizing in them, that we may laugh at them, the aspect from which they are most pleasant, because—experience has proved it—when one has laughed at destiny it is disarmed and its weapons no longer hurt one. In art the Gallic spirit is that *verve*, buoyant, coarse, gross, but of a grossness that belongs to nature, scatologic but not obscene; it is that "*blague*", which is applied to everything, abasing all that flaunts, crushing everything that is puffed up, equalizing conditions and fortunes which are all amenable to the intelligence; that "*blague*" perhaps of good-heartedness which dissimulates and dissipates with a laugh the emotion which affects the heart. This "*blague*" comes from the pride of men who do not wish to be duped by anything, who are astonished at nothing, who "dont care about it", who can be made to believe nothing; this "*blague*" may partake of heroism when it is the pleasantry of a wounded man bleeding upon the

battlefield, or the gross word of a soldier who refuses to retreat before a stronger adversary, who can conquer or kill him, but who will never have the right to "*blaguer*" him.

There are many forms of the Gallic spirit. One of the most delicious is that of Gavroche, the gamin of Paris, who has grown up on the pavements of the capital, who has formed his intelligence from the varied spectacles of Paris, his morality from his experience of the streets and his vocabulary from all the argots which abound in the shops and the cinemas. But *Gaspard* is all this; he is the Gallic spirit incarnate; he is a soldier-Gavroche, the snail-seller of the Rue de la Gaieté, turned loose into the war. Injured in the first affair in which he takes part, he knows best the trains for the wounded and the hospitals. But how he animates them by his laughter, how he enlivens them by his drollery! Well again, he returns to the front; he knows the trench, the underground chamber, the communicating tunnel. This damp obscurity does not please him; he does not mould there for long; he loses a leg; he returns to the hospital. There we see him maimed; but Gaspard is a gay cripple. Crutches are a new element for drollery and gaiety in his life. He becomes legendary, his reputation equals that of the vedettes of the theatre, so much so that an American offers him a large sum to act as the great attraction of a shop for artificial limbs. And it is time that the book should end, because Gaspard, intoxicated by his success, becomes conscious of his drollery and exaggerates it. He will no longer be Gaspard, that is to say, the natural man. The success of *Gaspard* has been immense, inordinate. People desired to see in this genial wag the French soldier of the great war. This is a mistake. Gaspard exists, but he is not the army, which has a little more gravity and less *verve*. However, it is useless to protest against a legend which has been spontaneously formed and which in short flatters our national self-love. It is better to note the danger to literature in such a success. The vocabulary

of Gaspard is saturated with words borrowed from the argot of the streets, the argot of the barracks, and from the revived burlesque comparisons of Scarron. These foul elements may injure the French language. It will be good taste during the war and after the war to use a popular language which is not over-nice and which savours of the trenches; it will be good form to speak "*poilu*" and to speak "Gaspard". It is necessary that good sense should react against this fashion: that Gaspard return to his snails on the Rue de la Gaieté, that he go upon his artificial legs about his own business; that he have the military medal and that he be honoured as a hero. But really it is not necessary that France speak his language.

The poets have been reproached for not knowing how to attune their lyre to the glorious sounds of war. The army is carving out for them a gigantic epic, greater than that of Napoleon. Above the battles float mystic ideas, and "miracles" are spoken of; whatever may be the meaning of this word, it indicates in epic reality the presence of the element of wonder necessary to the inspiration of the poet. However, we still await Homère Théroulde or Victor Hugo.

It is not that the poets have kept silent in order to reflect. The reviews are filled with their ardent improvisations. Collections of their fragments may be made; their elegant trifles are recited on every stage. But these are improvisations, fragments, trifles. Patience! the great work which we ask in vain from Edmond Rostand or from Jean Richepin will be given to us some time later by a soldier whom the German bullets shall have spared, whose name no one knows, and who does not know himself the treasure of poetry which he carries in his soul. There is a time for action and a time for dreams, and epic material does not easily suffer itself to be enclosed in verse so long as it is living. The reality is too poignant for us to take pleasure in the contemplation of fiction.

There are, however, beautiful touches in the poems of Rostand, Richepin, Zamacoïs, Haraucourt, Dorchain, and in the collections of Xavier Simon,[41] Charles Normand,[42] Alexander Hepp,[43] Georges Trouillot.[44] Certain bizarre minds desired to offer for our admiration the *Poèmes de France*, by Paul Fort,[45] and it is necessary to recognize that in these poetic phrases of five lines which dissemble verse, there are, here and there, in the midst of wilful puerilities and affected gibberish, great and sublime images which rise up like columns of light. But I see only two collections of epics which attract attention by extended effort and by the reach of their symbolism: they are the *Divine Tragédie*, by Henry Bataille,[46] and the *Témoin*, by Jean Aicard.[47]

The tumultuous compositions and the sometimes strange prosody of Henry Bataille are known. He has taken from Victor Hugo his exuberant and grandiose language; into a poem on a restrained subject he thrusts inappropriate words; he accumulates them, he piles them up to satiety. He swells out his voice like a man on the stage who is accustomed to force his tones in order to get over the footlights and to obtrude himself upon the indifference of the public. He makes disproportionate gestures which menace the heavens; his sobs are death-throes and his cries shrieks. But here the subject is so immeasurable and so terrible that this cheap rhetoric appears to be a sincere effort to raise himself up to the level of the reality. One does not revolt against the extravagances of the poet because one thinks of the horror of the battlefield, which is worse than that of his verse.

The epic poem of Henry Bataille is a symphony in red: blood gushes there and colours every vision. Earth and heaven have taken on that bloody tint which blinds and leads to hallucinations. In vain we close our eyes, we

[41] *La France Héroïque.* [42] *Les voix de la Fournaise* (Perrin).
[43] *Les coeurs embellis* (Fasquelle). [44] *Gavroche et Flambeau* (Fasquelle).
[45] Fasquelle edit. [46] Payot edit. [47] Flammarion edit.

smell the blood which flows; we hear it trickle in the garden fountain; in vain we flee and seek refuge in the depths of the wood, we hear it well out in the rivulet which gurgles under the moss. The epic of Henry Bataille is a symphony of death: the corpse is there enthroned. In a wild frenzy the poet exposes the charnel-house; we must breathe its odour; see, how he will cut short, so he thinks, the banality of our pity and our pleasant phrases. Death is the real sovereign of the war; it commands the armies and presides over the combats; it is a goddess. At the close of his poem Henry Bataille holds up the death which Ligier Richer sculptured for his tomb, that powerful skeleton which defies the winds soughing through its bones—

"That death, erect, which holds out its heart towards the storm"—

and he invokes the divine Death. However, this poem of death is also an epic of humanity. The sentiments have no tenderness; the passions are nearly animal; but the intensity of the love and sorrow are expressed there in cries which recall Lucretius. There is one striking fancy among them all. The war is finished; the signal which ends the combats has resounded. Suddenly from the horizon there hastens a passionate flock. Are these wild beasts who come to feed upon the dead? No, these are the mothers who come to seek for their children:

Nous l'attendions. C'est lui! c'est le troupeau des mères
Dont rien ne peut calmer ni retenir la course,
Et qui s'en vont, les yeux attachés à la terre
Ainsi qu'on voit marcher tous les trouveurs de sources.
Car il s'agit de s'arrêter juste à la place
Où des tressaillements qui les prirent déjà
Quand dans leurs flancs battaient leurs rejetons vivaces,
Viendront les avertir tout à coup que c'est là!

Alas! the earth has mingled with everything and has devoured everything, and it is in vain that the mothers seek a dust among the dust. Moved with pity, the poet addresses them:

Mes soeurs, ne voûtez pas plus longtemps votre échine.
Ce n'est pas là qu'ils sont, mes soeurs, vous vous trompez.
Ce n'est pas là que tous ces corps sont encloués,
Pas plus que leurs canons au fond des trous de mine,
Et vous pourriez cent ans errer dans Césarée,
Vous ne trouverez pas celui que vous cherchez.
Nous vous crions que chaque tombe est délestée! . . .
Tenez, voici la place où vos fils sont cachés.
Frémissante du vieil espoir invétéré,
La troupe a répondu: "Je ne vois toujours pas! . . ."
Quoi! Vous ne voyez pas? . . . Non, folles! pas si bas! . . .
Mais levez donc les yeux! Et vous les trouverez.

These moments of inspiration are rare in the *Divine Tragédie*, although the title would make one think of the *Divine Comedy* of Dante. It is the circles of the infernal regions that attract Henry Bataille, however, and he gives himself up to the violence of an inspiration constantly directed towards the horrible.

More human and more tender is Jean Aicard. The work of his whole life has been the exaltation of kindness. But the poet's faith in kindness has received from reality such rude shocks that it is shaken by them. And then when the horrible war is unchained upon the world, this has appeared for a moment like a mockery. It is in a heavy hour of doubt that the poet, on his way to his home, meets one evening a tired old man who seems to come from the depths of the centuries. Upon a hill facing the sea the dialogue takes place, and the poet tells the mysterious traveller all his wrath and despair: Jesus promised to the world peace and the reign of love; His promises sound like irony. In order to reply to this plaint of a wounded soul, the traveller makes himself known: he is the witness, he who mocked at Jesus, fallen on the road to Calvary, and whom Jesus condemned to live and to wander about the world, that he might bear witness to the Redemption. Such a one is able to judge the work of Christ and to judge the world since he has before his eyes twenty centuries of history.

Je marche sans repos, pour être le Témoin.
Derrière moi, le jour où je partis est loin,
Plus loin peut-être encore est devant moi ma halte;
Mais ma foi dans le jour qui m'est promis, m'exalte,
Et lorsque, par moments, les peuples plus heureux,
Ont des princes moins durs ou moins de haine entre eux,
Alors, je sens venir la paix, et comme une onde,
En mes veines courir la jeunesse du monde;
Un jeune espoir joyeux marche avec mes pieds lents;
Pour le monde et pour moi, qu'est-ce que deux mille ans?
J'ai deux mille ans, j'ai vu Lutèce et les deux Rome,
Et les hommes mourir, mais vivre et grandir l'Homme.
Car l'homme a la durée et chacun n'a qu'un jour.
Les générations font chacune à son tour,
En criant vers le ciel, leur chemin vers l'abîme . . .
Or tout mortel, n'ayant que sa minute infime,
Nomme ses moindres maux, le comble des malheurs,
Et ne reconnait pas si les temps sont meilleurs;
Mais moi qui mesurai les horreurs de la vie
Sur la route au tombeau par vingt siècles suivie,
Moi qui raillai Jésus tombé sur le chemin,
Je sens mon coeur plus large et l'homme plus humain.

The poet feels consoled by this faith in moral progress. But how can he hope again for the reign of Jesus in this war which is a return to barbarism and the negation of all the spiritual conquests of which civilization is proud? The witness declares still more loudly his faith in progress; unique in its barbarity, this war is unique also in its moral splendour; it has incited the most absolute heroism and the most tender kindness. The aim of this war is not to conquer or to defend lands, its aim is to defend goodness, love, the law instituted by Jesus; it is a holy war, it is a crusade. It is now that the reign of God is approaching. And from the depths of the shadows he cries out his confidence in the light. The poem ends in this magnificent act of faith. Jean Aicard remains faithful to the ideal of his whole life and he finds verses harmoniously filled with youthful and brave tenderness to proclaim very exaltedly the faith of his soul, which is the faith of the French soul.

Such are the principal literary manifestations of French thought during the war. I make no pretention to have

spoken of all of them. It would be necessary to mention that book so rich in thought which is called *l'Étang de Berre*, by Charles Maurras,[48] and the noble biography of Pius X which Camille Bellaygue has written.[49] The books of Mme. Adam[50] and of Léon Daudet,[51] would also deserve mention since we are recalling the history of an epoch in which the present war was wrought out. But I have held myself to remaining within the cycle of the war. I desired to name works, not to judge them. Criticism at the moment is blind and disarmed: nobility of intention, grandeur of feeling, purity of patriotism, mask sometimes a real artistic poverty. How shall one see it? And if one sees it, how speak of it? At the present hour all that is good is beautiful. Tomorrow criticism will take up its laws again; it ought to do so in order not to allow the standard of values to become confused. It is possible that a great many of the works written during the war may be condemned to oblivion.

In any case, no one can dispute their admirable unity. This literature has seized the human idea which illumines this war and makes its inspiration. There is not one of our writers who may not feel and say that we are struggling to defend beauty. They look at reality which is hideous. They testify to the local and transient victories of brute force, but they do not fear its final triumph. They do not even take the trouble to curse it; rather, they are sure that it will be vanquished, because it must be, because justice, beauty, right, cannot perish. A literature which is able in the most horrible of conflicts to exalt itself to these serene ideas is a magnificent proof of the vitality of the Latin spirit and deserves the respect

---

[48] Champion edit.

[49] *Pie X et Rome* (Nouvelle Librairie Nationale).

[50] *L'Entre deux Guerres; Devant la douleur* (Nouvelle Librairie Nationale).

[51] *L'heure vengeresse des crimes bismarkiens* (Nouvelle Librairie Nationale).

of the world.[52] If it has not in itself complete beauty, it royally opens the way for the French literature of tomorrow, which will have the leisure to be beautiful. That literature will be realistic, for it must exist in facts and in truth. The dreams which make the world lost to sight may perhaps be beautiful, but they are dangerous we know, because they prevent our perceiving the hostile machinations of force. That literature will be mystic, for it is thought which will have saved us. To have felt that the future of human ideas would depend upon us will have put into our souls an invincible vigour and will have made to float above our cannon those mysterious ideals which are never vanquished. Realistic and mystic, rejuvenated by energizing saps, that literature will perhaps be the source of an intellectual springtime, of a new *Aufklärung*. It will teach to peoples—that which other peoples have said for a long time but which this war was about to obscure—that it is necessary to put humanity and beauty above everything and to surround them with a powerful protection, that they may be sheltered from mad enterprises, and that it may be possible for them to continue to flourish, even if the fancy seizes two peoples to dispute concerning their future in the lists.

[52] A special edition of selected pages written by our great authors during the war has been made by the Librairie Larousse and is intended for foreign circulation. The volumes which have already appeared (Maurice Barrés, Ernest Lavisse, Emile Boutroux), make one anticipate a collection of the greatest interest.

The Place of Suffering in the Spiritual Life

By Adeline M. Bedford.

The following short address[1] was given from rough notes on April 3, 1916, to the Members of the Religious Thought Society, and was followed by a discussion in which the subject was handled by persons far better qualified than the writer to deal with matters of such deep import. At the earnest request of a friend (whose wishes I cannot disregard) I have worked the notes into a more consecutive form: some new matter has also been added. The line from Browning must explain and excuse my presumption in dealing with a subject which, perhaps more than any other, is uppermost in the minds and hearts of thinking people at the present time. A. M. B.

Chenies, Rickmansworth,
June, 1916.

"Its drop comes from my heart—that's all."—*R. Browning.*

The existence of suffering is generally admitted to be an integral part of human life; in a greater or less degree there are tears in all mortal things. The shadow cast by transience, by decay, and above all by the fact of mortality, falls upon a world which we feel could never, under our present imperfect condition, be wholly in the light.

Moreover, suffering is inherent in all human beings who are in a normal state of mental and emotional development. It is pathetic to observe how early some child-natures cross the line which divides instinctive enjoyment from the higher regions of happiness, meeting, at that

[1] Should separate copies of the above article be desired it is being published as a booklet by A. R. Mowbray & Co., Ltd., London and Oxford.

point, the quiet figure of pain which will walk henceforth beside the maturing soul. The artless acceptance of this double experience is one of the marks of the true child-spirit. May we not say, without fear of contradiction, that where there is love there also is pain?

Let us consider it thus: the great human joys—love, marriage, fatherhood, motherhood, filial devotion, friendship and the like—are lined (so to speak) with loss, disappointment, distress, anxiety.

Nevertheless these are the great coveted experiences, the "abundance of a man's life", the satisfactions of the heart which may be forgone but not replaced. In a word, the chief component parts of human life are made from the mingled elements of joy and pain. We cannot regret what we do not enjoy, or fear to lose what we do not prize. Love trembles and rejoices, fears and hopes, sobs and smiles.

The forces of human nature develop along differing lines in different personalities; joy and pain alike take the stamp of the whole nature of which they form part of the experience. The lower types centre round the suffering self or the satisfied self, both grow apace, with due encouragement.

The higher, while more sensitive and exposed to impressions of every kind, do not wholly appropriate either joy or pain to their individual being. They carry them into a larger sphere. It is characteristic of truly developed natures that they expand their power of loving, and consequently of bearing the pain side of joy. It was said of Florence Nightingale that she felt the suffering of every soldier as if he were her own son, and this process of expansion has been going on in many hearts at the present time. The weights and measures which served for individual lives in the past have been put aside. This enlargement is not necessarily a conscious or reasoned experience, and may seek no expression in the language of the spiritual life. But it is the homely stuff which be-

comes enriched and ennobled when shot through with the shining glory of the grace of God.

The same is true of sacrifice. In all parts of the world a glorious sacrifice is being offered, instinctive, un-self-conscious, entire. It is a witness to the fact that man lives by honour and duty; if he fails in these he is dead while he lives. Every day as the brave tale of heroic deeds is renewed we feel the splendid irony of the old words, "Fear not them that kill the body and after that have no more that they can do." But these thoughts are ours not theirs. Sacrifice is often truest when purely instinctive. The soul leaps to higher waters, flashing through the swirl and tumult of the stream beneath. Any effort of reasoning seems to dim or confuse the nature of the offering. A quotation from a famous novel may serve to illustrate this point. Romain Rolland in the history of the musician *Jean Christophe* shows his hero devoting himself to a sick friend, thus abandoning the art which he loved with passionate intensity. He is upbraided for making so great a sacrifice, and replies:

"Je ne me suis pas sacrifié, et si je me suis sacrifié c'est parceque cela me fait plaisir. Il n'y a pas tant a discuter. On fait ce qu'on doit faire. Si on ne le faisait pas, c'est pour le coup qu'on serait malheureux. Si un sacrifice est une tristesse pour vous, ne le faîtes pas, vous n'en êtes pas digne."

The union of love and pain, the expansion of love beyond personal objects, and the consequent increase in the sources of pain, the instinctive sacrifice, the intuitive surrender—all these are premonitions of the full truth revealed in the great Sacrifice. The Hindu Christians are accustomed to dwell on the thought that an Incarnate God must needs die of a broken heart because of the sin and sorrow of the world. Infinite love, they might say, equals infinite pain, and perhaps we should add that infinite pain involves infinite sacrifice and is one with infinite joy. The suffering of God made man, that strange and awful mingling of the human with the Divine, is an inexhaustible theme not for contemplation only, but for

spiritual interpretation. It sustains the individual sufferer because it brings him into relation with that Divine experience not only in the hour of his own death and passion, but in humbler acts of daily self-donation, for—

"Every kindness to another is a little death in the Divine Image."

In all ages voluntary suffering, endured in union with the Passion, is joyfully offered. We may shrink from asceticism and from the whole system of self-inflicted sufferings with repugnance, or we may recognize in those who practice them a certain dim majesty which baffles our otherwise ready analysis. In any case, the more closely we look into the mirror of revelation, the less defined are the objects perceived. The picture is too large for the frame. There are some forms of physical blindness in which there is partial vision within a certain range. Thus a semi-blind man of this type may be aware of a figure standing beside him, he can identify the hands and dress, but he cannot raise his eyes to scan the countenance of his friend. Some souls have met, it seems, the eye of the suffering God, and they can never look at anything else.

We must now pass on to consider the question of pain apart from the Christian interpretation. It may be, and often is, finely endured and accepted as part of the stern law which controls human affairs. Or it may rouse evil elements—despair, hatred, blasphemy, a threefold invitation to the powers of evil to enter the heart and possess the whole being.

In the present appalling catastrophe we find all the gamut of pain, the fierce resentment and the sublime acceptance. And in all tones, whether gentle or defiant, the same question forces its way to utterance—"What means this intolerable anguish, what can this cataclysm of pain betoken?" Many great teachers bid us remember that calamity follows sin, that unrighteousness is judged, and the nation that forgets God is doomed unless it repent. The attempt to measure guilt with judgment and virtue

with mercy, while true in its own sphere, does not serve as a final interpretation. It might be more in accordance with the glimpses that we gain from the utterance of prophets and of seers concerning the ultimate purposes of the Most High, to say that, a conflict of so unexampled a nature on earth was in some sort a reverberation of a mighty uprising, in the sphere of the unseen, of the world-powers and the spirits which direct these great hidden forces against the hosts of the Lord and of His Christ. If this be true, it is certain that the prince of this world finds willing subjects and ready allies in all the nations, that he calls such powers to his aid, and therefore the wickedness of the world powerfully contributes to catastrophic judgments such as we now witness. Nor can we doubt that a great number of faithful intercessors, both on earth and beyond it, are largely concerned in determining the issue. The mystery of prayer, its depth and height, can never be fully known on earth: it is "something understood", but not explained.

Turning from the great world problems let us consider some aspects of the suffering of the individual soul. Love, the flower of human life (we say), must needs bear the fruit of pain: the same law brings forth each after his kind.

But there are conditions of blight when the tree is sapless, brown in the time of blossom, bare in the season of fruit. So may the soul be numbed with the drawn-out penance of living, incapable of the experience of either joy or pain. The flat monotony of a baffled existence is, maybe, sadder than a bruised and broken heart. There are no rough and ready answers to problems of this nature. But this one may say, "Not one of them is forgotten before God." To be remembered by God is to *live* in the true sense of the word. Each life, however insignificant to human eye, has a strange "value" in the eternal world; and that, too, in the last resort, is the true measure of all earthly existence,

A question based on the subject under consideration, namely, the place of suffering in the spiritual life, should be briefly touched upon. The reproach of Christianity is that it is the worship of suffering. It would be truer to say that it is the interpretation of suffering. But the fact remains that many Christians regard suffering as the chief, if not the only, means of identification with a Crucified Lord.

There is a higher and larger conception of the Christian life if we are able to receive it. We are vowed, not to sorrow—but to God. Not to joy—but to God. Not to satisfaction—but to God. Not to suffering—but to God.

The goal of Christian effort is towards none of these things, but to a profound obedience, which is wrought out by the mingling of them all.

Nevertheless, to the wistful human question, "Does the road wind uphill all the way?" we are compelled to answer "Yes—to the very end." On the higher levels we get a larger view. Above the mists of earth we may look forth to the long stretches of the shining land where there is no more pain.

> "Then long Eternity will greet us with the bliss
> Of an individual kiss.
> And Joy will overtake us like a flood,
> And everything that is sincerely good
> And perfectly divine,
> With Truth and Peace and Love,
> Will ever shine."

George Cassander:
A Reformation Champion of Reunion

By W. L. Bevan.

One has to go a considerable distance back in the history of the nineteenth century before one finds any work directly and exclusively dealing with the history of the reunion of Christendom. No such work has ever been written in the English language, and it might be said that the lack of it simply proves the common sense inherent in the Anglo-Saxon character. Christendom, it is true, has not been reunited, so why write the history of reunion? Such a history might not have the finality of a History of Crime, or a History of the Political Platform, both of which exist in the English language; but it would be hardly more futuristic than Lord Acton's long planned History of Liberty, nor would it be more theoretical than the many current histories of Socialism. There have been *cases* where dissevered churches have been reunited, and there is a very considerable amount of literature dealing with proposals by which divided Christianity might be reunited. These proposals come at least from names as conspicuous as those associated with socialistic schemes of organizing mankind. Hugo Grotius and Leibnitz stand in the front rank of writers and thinkers, and both of them were interested in the reunion of Christendom and discussed the question in their writings. Among the works which Grotius thought worth printing in his Via Pacis was a tract by George Cassander, and in giving prominence to George Cassander as an advocate for the union of Christendom

Grotius was in accord with the general agreement of the age before his time, when the irenic works of Cassander were largely circulated and highly regarded. It is still a matter of interest to give some details of the life and thought of a man who in the midst of the storm and stress of the Reformation period tried to keep his balance and gave the best that was in him to the restoration of Christian unity.

In the life of the humanist one cannot look for adventures or hair-breadth escapes such as are recounted in the autobiography of Benvenuto Cellini, nor is there presented any of the versatility of interests such as one finds in the life of Leonardo da Vinci. The letters of Erasmus show how calm the current flowed for the circle who were devoting themselves to studious pursuits in the midst of great historic events. Occasionally a man of the type of Julius Caesar Scaliger made up for the lack of external excitement by constantly involving himself in the troubled waters of literary controversy. Theologians of course, were more important people. They lived in great events; they influenced the men in power in government circles and in many cases they formed the connecting link between the rulers of the state and the classes beneath them who in the sharp and unexpected turns of political life were treated hardly better than pawns in the game. George Cassander was both in temperament and education a member of the humanistic class, and his life history shows both the limitations of this class and also the deep feeling excited in its members by the religious revolution which was taking place before their eyes and in whose course they must have felt bound to interfere, hoping possibly to direct it. It was the characteristic of the men in the humanist movement to assume that their ideas were more commonly understood and more generally appreciated than they actually were.

Born in 1513, only four years before Luther nailed his theses to the door of the Church in Wittenberg, George

Cassander devoted himself to the study of classical literature at the University of Louvain, which had been the scene only a short time before of the prolonged struggle between the advocates of the new and the old learning. His record as a student must have been a good one because in 1541 he was appointed by the burgomaster of Bruges to the professorship of classical literature lately founded in that city by a patron of learning, Bishop Johann DeWitte, a native of the town. Spanish rule in the Netherlands was not a favorable atmosphere for one who desired quietly to understand the meaning of the religious changes which were taking place so close at hand, and which could not be prevented from winning the sympathy of large numbers in the Low Countries in spite of the disfavor of the government.

Cassander was soon accused of sympathy with the new movement, and it became impossible for him to prolong his stay in Bruges. Accompanied by a close personal friend, Cornelius Wouters, and not unnaturally inspired by the example of so many other humanists, he devoted several years to travelling. His journeys took him through France and Italy as far as Rome. In 1544 he reached Cologne and here he determined to settle down. This city seemed to him like a sure haven provided by Divine Providence, and in a personal letter he tells in unambiguous phrases of the reasons why he could not return to his native land. "May I finally come to hear", he says, "that the divine and truly Christian teaching, which has forced you and me and many other completely blameless men into exile, finds a place in our fatherland. May the heavenly Father finally grant to our own people that the holy Gospel be preached among them pure and unfalsified. It is true I do not desire to return to my country, but I would be glad to know how to help the thousands of honest men who with sighs and tears are there longing for the Kingdom of God".

There were reasons why Cologne would be particu-

larly acceptable to a man of Cassander's liberal religious views. The famous archepiscopal see was presided over by Hermann Von Wied, who was notoriously in sympathy with the principles of the Lutheran movement. In 1541 Martin Bucer had been summoned to Cologne by the Archbishop to arrange ways and means for a religious compromise. In 1543 Archbishop Hermann accepted a scheme drawn up by Bucer and Melanchthon which was intended to pave the way for the introduction of the Lutheran Church order in Cologne. So at least the enemies of the Archbishop said. In the controversy which followed Archbishop Hermann denied any such intention and claimed that he only meant to reform the churches in his diocese by removing from the practices of the Church all elements due to mere human invention. The end of the contemplated movement was fatal to the Archbishop for he was deprived of his see in 1546 by Pope Paul III and when the Emperor Charles V undertook to carry out the Papal decision Hermann himself sent in his resignation.

So far as we know Cassander observed a studious reserve in these troubles. He lived quietly in association with his intimate friends who appreciated the mild and considerate traits in his retiring nature. We catch a glimpse in his writings later on of the influences brought to bear upon him by life in an atmosphere of religious controversy. He tells us he kept himself removed from all partisanship and yet at the same time his neutrality was not due to indifference. He carefully read the writings published by both sides in order to secure both an intelligent and an independent point of view. Cassander had no ambition to pose as a party leader. The kind of influence he wished to exert was indirect. Writing to his friend Ximenes he explains his position: "I can only undertake the rôle of an observer, not that of a leader. I can only fight against my enemies as an amateur. I am not able to keep up a serious struggle against a well

equipped army. I am inclined very much to work for peace but I feel myself from day to day more incapable of any kind of undertaking, both on account of my constant bodily weakness which often brings on severe attacks of fever, as also on account of my spiritual insignificance, my depression and the misery connected with my physical suffering. But in spite of this I will not cease so long as I live to think on such things and to beg and to ask God that He may stir up some able men who can undertake and carry forward this matter in a more proportionate and useful manner. I willingly, however, turn over to you all of my allies."

By his allies he evidently means his writings, by which he had undertaken to secure support for his irenic programme. He had first of all given his attention to liturgical study and had prepared new liturgical forms. He believed that by the use of such forms a spiritual interest in the proposed compromise would be promoted. The preface to his pamphlet Concerning the Mass explains his position. "I am moved to these studies both by a natural inclination towards them and by the conditions of the times. For the points of difference which today are disturbing almost the whole of Christendom consist chiefly in the differences of external form and in the ceremonies of divine worship. These are plain to the external eye and sense while the doctrines of the faith remain concealed in the depths of one's heart." With even more emphasis he speaks in a letter to a correspondent: "My view is that the unhappy division and splitting up of the Church would never have taken place if the old honored forms of worship had been maintained, and if even today a return to them would take place gradually the separated and severed members of the Church would again be united in harmony and to a certain extent in one body."

In 1556 he published some annotations to various Church hymns; these dealt especially with the veneration

of the saints, the value of good works, and the reception of the Sacrament of the Altar, and brought him into conflict with the officials of the University of Louvain in the matter of censorship. "I would never have thought it possible," he writes to the rector of the University, "that my annotations would have been placed upon the catalogue of forbidden books and this is all the more disagreeable to me since I am in no way able to account for this action." He goes on to say that he regards the exercise of the censorship as due to personal grounds for he knows that some of the members of the Louvain faculty are distinctly on his side. "It is seldom", he writes somewhat bitterly, "that just those people, who as teachers of the fear of God and the love of one's neighbor ought to be a living example of these qualities, depreciate so much the good reputation of their neighbors and even take no account of their property and their life".

His efforts to have the decision reversed proved fruitless. A few years later not only his annotations but other writings of his were placed upon the Roman Index. This experience, however, did nothing to discourage him, and he announced firmly that he had never intended to separate himself from the communion of the Catholic Church. In one letter to him his correspondent Masius throws the responsibility for the ill will against him on the shoulders of the Jesuits. Even Erasmus, he remarks, had been rendered suspect by Jesuit influence and it was not remarkable that Cassander's name should be found in the same class. It is pretty clear that this experience with an official censor prevented Cassander for a number of years from giving a written form to his ideas about Church union.

But in spite of his retirement his name became known far from Cologne and his advice was sought by those who were taking up the matter of religious compromise. The French court which was desiring to work for this

end had taken as its advisor Balduinus, a jurist who had once been a friend of Calvin and was at this time inclined to come to terms with the Roman Catholics. He had had a personal meeting with Cassander in 1557 at Frankfort and they had kept up a correspondence since then. Cassander found him thoroughly sympathetic with his views in regard to the slight prospect of establishing a religious peace by trusting to the activities of partisans on either side. Concessions must be made, the sources of Christian tradition must be investigated and he expressed himself willing to cooperate with Balduinus and the French court in an effort to bring about an understanding between the Reform party in France and the Roman Catholics. Cassander was on the point of going to France when his friend Ximines, who was now a professor at the University of Douai, advised him not to undertake the journey, because the religious differences had now brought about a condition of civil war between the two parties.

It was at this conjuncture that he published his small pamphlet on the Duty of a Pious Man in the Dissensions of the Church. It appeared anonymously because the author feared the consequences of his name becoming known and thereby involving himself with the civil authorities. Cassander begins by noting how perplexing and distressing is the present situation of the Church. Both sides are responsible for exaggerations due to passion and self-interest. Cassander's only ground for acting as a guide is based on his long and impartial investigation of the dissensions by which the Church has been divided. He speaks simply and unaffectedly of the influence of his early bringing up; from the days of his youth he has been most careful in his allegiance to the institutions and ceremonies of the Church, and yet his own temperament all along has made him altogether unsympathetic with anything like superstition. He recognizes that there is a great deal in the Church that needs to be re-

formed, but this does not mean that he advocates anything resembling a revolution in the ecclesiastical order that is come down from the time of antiquity. Purgation and emendation, not destruction, represent the main outline of his programme. An operation of uprooting things that give offense can be productive of no good.

This is his own personal conviction but however strong this conviction may be he is willing to read the books and weigh the arguments of those who are in favor of the most radical method of reform. To attain any sound result in such an investigation involves an attitude of aloofness. This is perfectly clear and Cassander avows that in working out his own position he desires to be influenced by no questions which affect the personal position or personal authority either of those who stand on his side or those with whom he disagrees. After all he says the real test is to be found in Holy Scripture itself. Nothing more firm or more certain can be discovered than the authority of the Bible, and here he is careful to state that the bare text of the Bible is in no way decisive. The meaning of Scripture must be determined not verbally but historically. This is evidently what he intends to imply when he uses a phrase difficult to translate literally, but which can be set down in a few English words, "the significance of the Scriptures themselves".

He makes an effective point when he says that the Apostles in their own writing put in a brief form matter which they must have expounded and explained to the people, for whom they were intended, in a much fuller form. Negatively this argument is reinforced by reference to the early heresies in the Church. The heretical teachers used words which can be found in the Scriptures. The fact that they parted from the early doctrines of the Church can only be discovered by those who are willing to depend upon the common consent and public witness of all the Churches. This is what is meant by the Apos-

tolic deposit of the faith. Those who received the doctrine of the Apostles were able to transmit to coming generations the genuine significance and the real meaning of the words that are found in the doctrine of the Apostles as contained in Holy Scripture.

Here we have Cassander's explanation of the meaning of Catholic tradition and Catholic truth. It is nothing else he says than an explanation and interpretation of the Scripture itself. To reinforce his position he quotes the authority of St. Vincent of Lerins, who used this twofold method of proof. First, Canonical authority, and secondly, Catholic tradition. By itself Canonical authority is not enough because the words of Scripture can be variously interpreted. For its genuine interpretation we must rely on Catholic tradition, and if we ask what Catholic tradition is the answer must be that tradition which is marked by the three notes of antiquity, universality and general consent. To illustrate his point he uses as an example of the word "logos" in St. John's gospel. The significance of this word has been the occasion of much discussion. Its real meaning can only be ascertained when we consult the interpretation placed upon it in the writings of the Fathers and in the decrees of the ancient councils of the Church.

In the disputed questions brought up by the religious revolution of the sixteenth century there were two classes of unequal size to be considered. There were the partisans on both sides who cared little for the appeal to history and there was a small group in both churches for whom antiquity had still a meaning. Such is the division which Cassander accepts. It was as plain to Cassander, the liberal Roman Catholic, as it was to Melanchthon, the friend and disciple of Luther, who, in explaining and defending the theological exposition contained in the Augsburg Confession, declared "Quaestio nostra est de quibusdam abusibus." That doctrine Cassander says is to be considered true and Catholic which is expressed in Holy

Scripture; but to this must be added the tradition in doctrinal matters handed down from the Apostles' time by the succession of regularly accredited teachers of the Church. Thirdly comes the doctrinal material derived indirectly from Holy Scripture; but such indirect derivation must have the authority of all the Churches, or in any case the greater part of them. Then comes in the fourth place the doctrine which is not explicitly contained in the Holy Scriptures nor supported by the consensus of the ancient Church. It has its sanction from the fact that it has been received in the Western Church, and since it is not plainly repugnant to the Holy Scriptures there is no reason why it should be violently opposed nor made the occasion of the disruption of the Church. This type of doctrinal declaration should be left in case there is uncertainty in regard to it, to the judgment of specialists; i.e. of the learned; and of those who are not carried away by their passions. But even if some sort of a consensus can be attained in this case such doctrine should not be made authoritative; there should be perfect freedom in the use or non-use of it. Some things certainly have been added to the teaching of the Church by error or ignorance, or may have been introduced into the later ages by official ambition or by the corruption of society. There is no reason why such additions should be treated as useful or profitable. The offense caused by them should not be disguised. As Cassander says in this case Christian prudence must be shown; there is no reason why anyone should speak at hazard or rashly, whatever he thinks. Nor, on the other hand, is a man ever bound to say anything contrary to what he thinks.

On the question of ceremonies, those instituted by Christ must be loyally observed. Nothing must be omitted, nothing added to them as instituted. In addition to these the Apostles and their successors had undeniably the right to institute ceremonies in the Church in accordance with the needs of the times. No organization can con-

tinue without the recognition of such a power. Besides, this power is fully recognized in the Acts of the Apostles and the Epistles of St. Paul. The early teachers and leaders of the Church did not hesitate to go beyond the formal declarations contained in the Gospels. Yet in the Church there are many customs observed that have been found subject to abuse or whose utility has passed away as times have changed. These might very well be abrogated. Yet one should be very tender in abandoning them, and the final decision should not be left to individual judgment but should be determined by a properly constituted authority. There are some ceremonies, too, which though instituted by the Apostles have ceased to be observed; they should be restored, but only by legitimate authority with the smallest possible disturbance.

Local differences are not bad in themselves. Cassander appeals to the great doctors of the fourth century against the attempt to reduce all of the customs of the Church to one single norm. He notices in discussing this question a dictum of an Italian writer of his own age that no abuse ought to be of such importance that on account of it the good use should be rendered impossible; rather in order to conserve the good use, abuses should be corrected. I do not deny, he goes on to say, that in these later times along with ignorance, avarice and ambition some superstitious acts of worship and ritual have come into the Church in such a way that they are inherently vicious and that the observance of them is an obstacle to the integrity of the faith. These must be abrogated by the highest official authority of the Church. This is the class which is exposed to the attack and defense of partisans. On the one side there are those who are zealous in maintaining them through a superstitious zeal, and because they are unable to distinguish dubious ritual from that which is religious and holy. On the other side there is a party which fails to see that certain practices

may be tolerated, when there is no question of their noxious or impious character. This is Cassander's conclusion after much careful thought and prayerful consideration, and it indicates his desire to eliminate all conscious partisan motives. The Western Church, which is the Church of his baptism, preserves, he contends, the doctrine of the Apostles, the sacraments instituted by Christ, and the observance of many ancient ceremonies. It is ruled by elders or bishops in a succession from the Apostles. "This, I say, is the true Church; the temple and home of God; and is no unworthy member of that great and Catholic Church." The fact that in his confession of faith and loyalty, Cassander uses the phrase "occidental Church" shows that clearly enough he recognized something resembling what has been called in modern times "the branch theory of the Church".

There is nothing in his words which indicates that he held that the Eastern Church was in any degree schismatical, not to say heretical. He quotes the generous declaration of Augustine in regard to the House of God sheltering and containing in its structure all kinds of material; even the imperfect parts of the building must be tolerated for the sake of peace; and those which are intolerable are objects of pity rather than objects of hostility. No process of cure can be called really remedial if it ends in destruction rather than reconstruction. He specifies here particularly those who are so offended by the abuses and corruptions of the Roman Church that they wish to withdraw from it. But on their side they are no more to be condemned than are those members of the Roman Church who refuse to recognize that there are diseased elements in the Church and who excommunicate those desiring to reform it and go so far as to use force and violence in repelling them. All of which things have given occasion to this unhappy schism.

Even crimes of this sort, bad as they are, cannot destroy the catholicity of the Church. We know from

the Gospels that the family of God is sometimes ruled by unfaithful servants, and our Lord Himself did not desert the inhabitants of Jerusalem although they had killed the prophets and stoned those to whom they had been sent. The same principle we see in His attitude towards the priests and the Pharisees. He blamed their tradition and warned his followers not to observe them; but at the same time He fully acknowledged their authority and their power. This principle should be applied by those who speak of the Church as anti-Christ because of the false opinions held and the unworthy practices done by those whom they call Papists. It is perfectly true, Cassander says, that the Church in the course of ages has lost its primitive purity. The stream has been fouled with alien elements, but the water of the river can be and must be restored to its original purity.

The same generous judgment must be conceded to those who are said to have deserted the Church and to be numbered among schismatics and heretics. Such a judgment is unjust and untrue, for the Church is the body of Christ; it cannot be deserted except through false doctrine; that is a doctrine which deals with the person of Christ in a way that cannot be harmonised with the Holy Scriptures. There can be no defection from the body by a diversity of ritual or opinion, but only by the lack of love. The rulers of the Church cannot cast out from its communion those members who have separated from it for lesser grounds than those indicated above.

Schism is not brought about by such official acts, and if those who are separated from external communion are still united by the bond of charity and of faith, they should not be treated as schismatics. It is true very few are to be credited with such an attitude. Most of them have no sympathy with the Roman Church and they treat it as a body certainly anti-Christ. This is a deplorable situation. How the marks of schism can be removed here is not plain, but as a matter of fact Cas-

sander points out that several of the leading reformers disapproved of schism, notably Luther, who distinguished between the Roman Church as a whole and its rulers. "I only resist", he said, "those who in the name of the Roman Church are trying to erect for us a Babylon". So in speaking of the Papal Bull he remarked, "it is enough glory assuredly for the Roman Church to be a small part of the Universal Church. This bull belongs rather to the Roman Curia". All the passionate statements of Luther, strong as they are, cannot weigh against these concessions. Cassander does not attempt to reconcile these contradictions. "We need not care much about it", he says, "nor do I think it is to be wondered at if the man has suffered human experiences". Even Calvin does not deny that there are within the Church of Rome, Churches of Christ; yet he speaks of the Pope and the Bishops in communion with him as wolves. Many followers of the reforming leaders revere the name of the Catholic Church and claim that name for themselves. They disapprove of the bitter attacks of Luther and sincerely desire that the communion of all Christians in the one body should be reestablished.

In a different class must be placed the various types of Anabaptists. These must be considered as heretics and schismatics. Yet the many simple souls among them have been led into error by a species of piety. Cassander would neither admit them into the fellowship of the Church nor would he so entirely condemn them, but prefers to leave them to be judged by the judgment of God—the uncorrupt Judge and the Parent of extreme mildness. Both the old Church and the new Church, called Evangelical, as the latter, too, still maintains loyalty to Christ, he venerates. The Evangelical Church adheres to the Apostolic Creed and has not separated itself from the other Churches by schism and therefore must be considered as a member of the true Church. This is not only true of the occidental churches but also

of the oriental, and he names particularly the Greeks, the Ruthenians, the Syrians, the Ethiopians and the Armenians. No diversity of ceremony or of theological points can break the unity which binds them together, provided they remain fixed in the foundation of the Faith with Christ the Head and in sincere Charity with His Body which is the Church.

"But above all", he continues, "I hate those odious partisan names, derived from Tartarus, when one party calls the rest Papists, Anti-Christians, the ministers of Satan, the enemies of the doctrine of Christ; and the other side calls the first Heretics, Schismatics, Apostates, and enemies of the Church of Christ. Both do nothing else than supply food and nourishment for the fatal schism and wretched dissolution of the Church". This does not mean that Cassander wishes to found a new and as it were neutral sect. All that he desires is to secure a place for free and equitable judgment, where the vices and errors of both sides can be sanely considered and reproved. Even if diversity of opinion and ritual continue there is hope of restoring a full and solid concord. To work for this is the duty of every devout soul in these days of peril and distress. Those who have this aim in view are the real Catholics.

There are two classes, strong at the present time; those who believe the old Church is ruined and think that its place can be taken by the followers of Luther and Calvin, and the other party who desire to see the old Church remain as it is, although they allow that there are corruption and abuses within it. They exalt the Roman pontiff to an extreme degree; they contend that his authority is not only above the whole Church, but over the Holy Scripture itself. His decisions are made equal to the divine oracles and are constituted as an infallible rule of faith. As to these, "I do not see why you should not call them pseudo-Catholics and Papists." The third party has little influence and exists in obscur-

ity. They incline to neither side, but whatever good may be found in either side they desire to accept and to encourage. They wish to work for conciliation, and indeed unless this small party secures influence and their council is heard the pacification of the Church is practically to be despaired of. The two parties of extremes do not believe in a peace which involves conciliation. Their idea is to wipe out and destroy their opponents.

The division of the Church seems to Cassander much like a civil dissension, in which the one party complaining that the laws have been corrupted by those who control the state and that it has been burdened by unjust laws are repelled and condemned, while they are proposing conditions and have been as it were forced to make a secession; hence the republic of the Church being divided in two parties since the dissension grows from day to day, has fallen into a state of the most bitter hatred and something resembling civil war, with the result that from one side very many unjust demands seem now to be made and the other side appears not willing to concede even what is fair. Both parties have their champions, whose sole object is to defend their own cause and attack the other party. But in both camps there must be some good and just men left, who are loyal to the republic and are trying to restore it to the original conditions under which it was founded.

There are two ways of acting in such conditions; you can be a partisan or you can try to be a peacemaker. You can treat those who are opposed to you as your permanent enemies, or you can treat them as fellow citizens and friends. This of course is a hard task in the thick of the contest but the work of the peacemaker will produce results that the antagonists themselves will allow to be beneficial. Now that Christendom is divided the office of the peacemaker is particularly difficult; everyone is considered to be an adversary if he does not agree in every respect with the watchwords of par-

tisanship. Those who are in favor of moderation and are working for peace are not the ones who attain to honor, dignity, and wealth. They can only look for their reward in the heavenly Jerusalem.

Those who have become apathetic toward religion because of religious dissensions are not to be excused. Love to God and love to one's neighbor are supreme obligations at all times. The foundation of true religion cannot be destroyed by the investigators of hidden things or by those who devote themselves to the study of arduous and difficult theological points. St. Paul's warnings against fables and genealogies may be applied here; and also the passage in his epistles in which he says: "If thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus and shalt believe in thy heart that God hath raised Him from the dead, thou shalt be saved." The same position is held by the Fathers of the Church, men like Iraenaeus and Hilary, who warn against intellectual subtleties and emphasize the value of simplicity in the faith. God does not call us to His holy rites by propounding difficult questions. Even when such discussions are permissible and salutary they are to be conducted with a Christian temper. Remember what St. Augustine says about the mystery of predestination, a subject to which he devoted such constant attention, such deep thought. Those who came to consult him about it he advised to thank God for understanding what they could of it and he counselled them above all to pray God for a larger understanding, preserving at the same time mutual peace and charity. This lesson might well be applied, Cassander thinks, to present religious difficulties. His watchwords are caution and diligence, not because we are afraid of danger but because of the possibility of injuring the consciences of our neighbor and disturbing public and private peace on account of non-essential questions.

Such are the counsels to be followed by private individuals. Those who are in official positions have nat-

urally a harder task. They cannot shut their eyes to perverse opinions and false types of worship. They are bound to protect themselves and to protect the Church against tyranny not by the arms of secular rule but by an appeal to scripture and to recognized ecclesiastical precedents. The peace that must be established is not a peace which rests upon a Church existing in servitude and corruption. The pamphlet closes with some remarks on the function of princes and popes in working out the programme of conciliation. Many mistakes have been made. The remedies that have been applied have only been palliatives. The disease is only increased. Bad counsel has been followed, because the aim has been not to cure diseases of the Church but to serve party ends. Civil rulers have made mistakes, sometimes because of pure ignorance. Those who could give better advice have not been allowed access or their intervention has been made the object of prejudicial attacks. After all the duty of the private individual has been in Cassander's mind all along; the citizen of God's Kingdom must remember that no material ends should guide his conduct. If this counsel is not heard by those in authority he will best imitate the conduct of those pious Jews who when the Pharisees and impious priests were lording it over the people, were content patiently to wait for the redemption of Israel.

Balduinus made use of Cassander's pamphlet in the conference held at Poissy and in this way it was brought to the knowledge of Calvin. Calvin, who detested Balduinus and accused him of being a renegade, supposed that this work had come from the pen of his old friend; it brought forth a characteristic piece of writing from the religious dictator at Geneva whose supply of vituperative adjectives was never lacking in religious controversy. Conservative Roman Catholics were equally displeased with the principles advocated in the pamphlet. It is somewhat singular to find that a reply to it

from one of the Low Country bishops could not be published in Brussels because in that city Cassander's programme was very favorably regarded. Encouraging news came also to its author that many theological professors in Cologne approved of it and that one of the German bishops was so pleased with its contents that he proposed to establish a theological seminary and summoned Cassander to be its head. Balduinus wrote from France that it was regarded as so important that he planned to have it translated into French in order to bring it to the attention of the Queen mother Catherine de' Medici. It is hardly likely that she would have been deeply stirred by it and it does seem rather curious that the Queen Dowager of France with her training in Italy should have been so linguistically inferior to the new Queen of England. There were not many of the current languages of Europe that Queen Elizabeth could not read, and as to classical learning, she could have set hard examinations in Latin and Greek to the statesmen ecclesiastical or civil who sat in her council board; but in the matter of being influenced by the pamphlet of the retiring humanist, George Cassander, Queen Elizabeth could certainly have shaken hands with her rival across the Channel. Neither of them were at all inclined to allow their governments to be influenced by the pious sentiments of humanistic scholars.

Now that France was closed to him by the energy of those who were proving "their doctrine orthodox by apostolic blows and knocks", a new hope presented itself in one of the small German principalities. Duke William of Cleve Julich-Berg had formally promised the Emperor Charles V that he would introduce no religious novelties within the duchy. As a matter of fact he practiced a kind of religious neutrality which he hoped might in the end lead to a reunion of the old and the new parties. He adopted Cassander's idea of getting members of both churches to unite in public worship and he called upon

Cassander to work out some sort of practical programme along this line. The churches in the jurisdiction of the duchy were under the control of the Archbishop of Cologne and Cassander was employed by Duke William to arrange a definite of concordat for common liturgical use. Cassander had a number of interviews with a conciliatory minded Lutheran leader, but on account of the strong opposition of both Roman Catholics and Lutherans no result came from these well-intentioned efforts.

In the next irenic movement Cassander was offered a larger field of usefulness. The Emperor Ferdinand, in order to protect his subjects from the advance of reforming innovations, advocated a policy of concession, towards certain of the Lutheran demands. He had read Cassander's work on the administration of the communion in both species and Cassander's remarks on the incapacity of the Council of Trent to advance the cause of Church reform found a willing hearer in the person of the Emperor. The failure of the council Cassander ascribed to the attitude taken by the Pope, and he condemned in no unmeasured terms the principles advocated by ultramontaine writers in their defense of the papacy. Now he was invited formally by the Emperor to spend two or three months in Vienna to consult over the new programme of Church reform. This invitation on account of his failing health he was unable to accept, but he set to work to make his contribution to the imperial programme by writing a tractate on the Augsburg Confession. This was finished at the close of the year 1564. In the meantime the Emperor Ferdinand had died and Cassander's pamphlet, a "Consultation concerning the controversial articles of religion between Catholics and Protestants", was sent to the heir to the imperial throne Maximilian the Second.

In this work the plan followed by Cassander is only to discuss those points in which he thought that Prot-

estants had unjustly presented Roman Catholic doctrine. For a time the publication of the pamphlet was delayed. Again Cassander was asked to visit Vienna but again he was obliged to refuse because of the condition of his health. A correspondent wrote to him that the Archbishop of Cologne was so pleased with Cassander's work that he offered to the author a free dwelling at Bonn where he could retire and devote himself to the restoration of his health. These favorable opinions, however, did not secure for the work its intended result. The new emperor was obliged to give up his plans for Church reform because he had to keep on good terms with his relative in Spain, Philip II, who was irrevocably opposed to making any concessions to Protestantism. In the meantime the spread of the Anabaptist movement in the territory of the Archbishop of Cologne had occasioned a great deal of alarm. The Archbishop requested Cassander to try his hand at mediation. Duke William II of Cleve joined in the request. In his answer he expressed himself as being hopeless as to the result of any conference with the representatives of this radical sect. Any cure for it would require a long and careful treatment.

It was in this environment where all of his hopes for reunion had come to naught that Cassander's life was brought to an end. He died in February 1566, and he seemed fated to share the misfortunes of many a peacemaker, for even after his death partisans of the old and the new faith waged a mighty war as to whether the dead champion of religious reunion had been a Roman Catholic or a Protestant. The reflections of this controversy are still apparent in modern encyclopedias; those written from the Roman Catholic standpoint, while they contend that Cassander could not have been a Protestant, allow he was a very poor Roman Catholic, and in the Protestant encyclopedias the hand of scorn is pointed at the unfortunate authors of these articles in Roman Catholic encyclopedias and reference is made to articles written

by Protestants who know better than anybody else what kind of a Roman Catholic Cassander was.

As a matter of fact this controversy might once and for all be set at rest. At least there is no occasion to revive it here and especially in these days when historical investigation has arrived at some few assured results at least in regard to the Reformation, and the condition of the Latin Church which preceded the religious revolution of the Fifteenth century. Until the work of humanism in the Roman Church was handed over to the Jesuits and their disciples the name of Erasmus was honored in many lands, which had refused to throw off allegiance to the Roman See. Erasmus disapproved of revolution. He had no more belief in its efficacy than Edmund Burke. He was opposed to violence in civil life. One gets a good picture of the Erasmian ideal of government—that is of a Christian polity founded upon the ethics of the Gospel—in Moore's Utopia. If revolution can accomplish nothing but harm in the sphere of the state it was Erasmus' point of view that it could be nothing but destructive in the sphere of the Church. Violence and the Gospel of Christ are contradictories, and as the Christian character is set apart from all other types of life by the various lines of approach it offers for ethical perfection there can be no way of forwarding individual or social morality in Christianity by deeds of violence or by the exercise of partisan hatred.

It can be easily seen that Cassander belongs to the Erasmian school of Christian thought. There are a great many interests present in the career of Erasmus which are not found in the career of George Cassander. Cassander more narrowly concentrated on theological questions than Erasmus ever did, but this cannot conceal the fact that Cassander was an Erasmian theologian, who believed that in the treatment of religious questions moral issues should predominate and who in his view of the polity of the Church relied on an appeal to his-

torical authorities, especially those of the first five and six centuries. This point of view is plain in the discussions of Cassander in regard to the celibacy of the clergy, the administration of the cup to the laity, but more particularly in his remarks on the constitution of the Church. Protestants had come into the habit of treating the Pope as anti-Christ. They had not invented this term of opprobrium themselves; they had simply taken over and gladly adopted the passionate phrases which had been used against the Papacy by not a few mediaeval mystics; by Ochino, for example, and by many of the members of the Franciscan order who were condemned by Pope John XXII.

In their attitude towards the Bishops, that is in their depreciation of the episcopal order, the Protestants of the Sixteenth century were only carrying out that depreciation of the episcopate that was a well-known feature of Church life in the Middle Ages, when the chief work in administration was handed over to the monastic order. It was hardly possible under the papal system as practically administered to exalt to any degree the episcopal order. Cassander is a legitimate representative in the humanistic dress of this view of episcopacy, and in accordance with humanistic methods he presents his point of view backed up by historical argument. In the Apostolic age he says there was no difference between the presbyter and the bishop. The bishop was exalted over the presbyter later on for the sake of orderly rule and to avoid schism. There are really only two orders in the ministry, the diaconate and the presbyterate.

Like Erasmus Cassander had a good deal to say of the bad effect of an illiterate clergy, and in the plan for a clerical seminary which was to be established in the Duchy of Cleve he drew up special regulations by which the candidates for the ministry should be protected against fanatical views and the growth of party spirit.

There was much anti-papalism in the mediaeval Church,

it can be seen in the works of Dante; it is even more apparent in the pamphlet discussions which arose at the time of the controversy between Boniface VIII and Philip IV. There was an advance in anti-papalism during the age of the general councils when a distinct effort was made to constitutionalize the papacy by international intervention. Cassander was only separated from this period by a century and there could have been no reason in his mind why he should regard himself as an insincere Roman Catholic simply because he presented in a humanistic form the arguments which had been acceptable to the religious leaders who took part in the Councils of Constance and Basel.

Cassander's attitude on this question was revealed on the occasion of the election of the Bishop of Münster in 1553. The see was in the land of the Duchy of Cleve and Cassander was consulted in regard to the papal oath of allegiance which had to be taken by the new bishop. The candidate regarded this oath, he said, as an obligation to support the papal tyranny and to destroy Christian freedom, and to engage in a policy of persecution. Paul IV gave the candidate his choice between either resigning or signing the oath. Cassander advised that the oath be taken and that the new bishop protect himself by a formal notorial declaration that would explain the sense in which the oath was taken. Nothing in the oath he said could be allowed to stand in the way of introducing Church reform in the diocese. A papal oath, he stated, is legitimate to a certain degree at least for bishops in the Western Church, but the pope has no right to treat Bishops as his vassals and to deprive them of their individual privileges as bishops in the Church of God. Besides the formula of the oath contains things which have more reference to the emperor than to the pope. As to the obligation to defend the rights of the pope it is impossible to promise this in cases where the pope demands obedience in matters where his presumed rights are in

conflict with divine and human rights. If the papal primacy is understood only as a precedence given the pope because of the greatness and significance of the city of Rome and the purity of the faith preserved in it, there is no difficulty in acknowledging such a primacy so long as it is used for the edification and not for the destruction of the Church. The taking of the papal oath therefore is to be treated as an obligation of limited loyalty.

Further comments on the position of the Papacy in the Church are to be found in a memorial presented by Cassander to the Emperor. Christianity as a whole, he declares, would gladly acknowledge the pope if the papacy preserved a Christian character, and showed its mission not by ruling but by serving, not by maintaining abuses but by working against their continuance. From antiquity the Roman Bishop has enjoyed a primacy in the Church and there would have been no division if the popes had not misused their power, and from ambition and lust of rule had not extended it beyond the limits allowed by Christ and the Church. This misuse of papal power which by adulators has been elevated beyond all bounds has been the cause of its complete rejection. It will be restored to the popes when they employ it for the edification of the Church in accordance with the Gospel of Christ and the tradition of antiquity.

The purely academic character of Cassander's writings and activities are as much in evidence by the arguments which he failed to use as by the arguments which he so constantly employed. As a member of the Republic of Letters, with well defined international community of interests, he seemed to have no consciousness of the connection between nationalism and religious organization. There is nothing in the pamphlets composed by him which would tend to bring together the confusing and conflicting interests of nations, and yet, as we see it today, there was practically no prospect of religious peace

which did not find some way of reconciling international centralization with national aspirations. There is indeed a recognition, in the pamphlet we have summarized, of the rights and influence of the Christian democracy. Cassander speaks of the Duty of a Pious Man, and he writes to influence this class, but whenever he moved practically to put his theories into effect he appealed to those in supreme civil authority. Now nothing is plainer in the Reformation than the powerlessness of the State when in conflict with the religious convictions of its members. Princes and rulers in the Reformation period could, and did, make use of the religious divisions of their people, but a solid block could be constituted by the people against the attempt of their rulers to force them to take any action which involved over-running popular conviction on a large scale. This is as true with regard to Protestant rulers as it is with Roman Catholic. Cassander's work considered too little the convictions and the wishes of the rank and file. His appeal confined itself to the literary classes, but he is not to be too much faulted for this mistake since all subsequent movements for the reunion of Christendom have failed to secure the popular touch. It seems likely that just as the Reformation itself could hardly have been carried through without a conjunction of spiritual and material interests, so the reunion of Christendom itself may hardly be accomplished by an appeal to spiritual motives alone.

THE
CONSTRUCTIVE
QUARTERLY

Normal Relations Between Rome and the Churches of the East Before the Schism of the Eleventh Century

By Louis Bréhier,
Professor of the University of Clermont-Ferrand.

The history of the relations between the Papacy and the Churches of the East has till now been viewed chiefly as the history of their conflicts. It is certainly on the subject of their quarrels, dogmatic, disciplinary and liturgical, that the sources give us most information. Consequently in studying this history the impression is gained of a state of perpetual feud. It has been reckoned that the Schism occupied about two hundred and three years of the period covering four hundred and sixty-four years from the accession of Constantine to the second Nicene Council (323–787).[1] To these two hundred and three

[1]Duchesne, *Églises separées*, Paris, 1896, p. 164.

years historians have given most attention, choosing to leave in the background the two hundred and sixty-one years during which harmony reigned in the Church. In spite of incessant quarrels and prolonged schism, it was not until 1054 that the rupture was completed.

Was this rupture inevitable? Was the schism of a fatal character? Controversialists of the two parties maintain that that was the case. They have put in the foreground the permanent causes of disagreement, and have too often given insufficient recognition to strong individuals who, for reasons not always religious, desired the separation and were its real agents.

The question has seldom been raised, whether in spite of the real grounds for the conflict, the unity which had lasted more or less from the fourth to the eleventh century might not have been prolonged by the help of good-will on both sides. It was precisely in the eleventh century that important theological disputes abated; dogmas were fixed and recognized by all the Churches. If instead of emphasizing that which divides and irritates, that which draws together and binds had been insisted on, might it not have been possible to continue to live in the same communion?

Good judges have thought so. In the seventeenth century Allatius in his treatise *De Ecclesiæ Occidentalis atque Orientalis perpetua consensione*[2] writes proving that the two Churches have always been and still are united in the same faith. More recently Mgr. Duchesne, after having drawn a picture of the schisms which separated the two Churches, concluded: "In itself this Greek autonomy has nothing incompatible with ecclesiastical unity. African autonomy, organized earlier, found it was possible to live with the Holy See. Mutual understanding was all that was necessary. It must not be believed that this is unattainable."[3]

As a matter of fact in the intervals of conflict normal

[2]Cologne, 1648. [3]Duchesne, *Églises separées*, p. 196.

and peaceful relations prevailed between the Holy See and the Churches of the East. These had their recognized places in the universal Church. A uniform body of institutions, usages, practices and arrangements assured the normal play of relations between the Churches. The schism violently destroyed this harmony, but it nevertheless existed, and it may be interesting to study the conditions.

The difficulty in dealing with the problem is that we are obliged to rediscover the terms of this unity by the aid of sources which tell us almost exclusively about the conflicts. The difficulty, however, may be overcome. If no contemporary thought of giving a general view of the normal relations between the Churches, still the history of the quarrels which came to disturb these relations will nevertheless allow us to get some idea of what they were.

We can discover some of the institutions which assured regularity of intercourse. Further we see that for the majority of questions which might divide the Churches peaceful solutions and compromises were proposed. Lastly, personal intercourse between the faithful of the East and the West, the exchange of ideas so frequent before and even after the schism, show us that real communion prevailed between them, and that despite different customs, they felt themselves to be members of the same Church.

I

In the first place through what customs did communion between the Churches find its expression? By what intermediaries were these relations maintained?

Since the sixth century a certain number of precise rules had been laid down and it is easy to see that this procedure remained in force till the schism of the eleventh century.

Immediately after their elections the Pope and each of the four Patriarchs of Constantinople, Alexandria,

Antioch, and Jerusalem exchanged professions of faith (*Synodica*), drawn up by the *synod* which presided at the election. Each of them in transcribing the articles of the Creed and in emphasizing the importance of the disputed questions settled by the Councils, affirms the purity of his orthodoxy. These *Synodica* were conveyed by special envoys chosen from among the clergy.

In 590 Pope Gregory the Great sent Bishop Bacauda to carry synodal letters to the Patriarch John of Constantinople. Again in 595, Cyriacus, Patriarch of Constantinople, sent Georgius, a priest, and Theodore, a deacon, to Rome for the same purpose. The recipient of the letter in his turn answered approving the profession of faith of his correspondents. The correspondence of the Popes with the Patriarchs proves to us that this custom was general. One letter of Gregory the Great even shows that no communications were exchanged between newly elected and other Patriarchs till after the despatch of these synodal letters. A monk of Isauria had appealed to the Pope and been exonerated from all blame, but Gregory writes him that he cannot inform the new Patriarch of this decision until he has, according to custom, received from him his synodal letter.[4]

When, after a period of schism, accord was re-established, the despatch of synodal letters was even more naturally the first pledge of reconciliation. We thus see Tarasius immediately after his election as Patriarch in 784 addressing his profession of faith to Pope Adrian. It is important to note that even after the Photian dispute, and on the eve of the schism of the eleventh century, this custom was maintained. In 1052 Peter, elected Patriarch of Antioch, sent his profession of faith to Pope Leo IX. In a letter written in 1054 to the Patriarch of Grado, Peter says that he has entrusted his letter to a pilgrim of Jerusalem, and complains of having received no answer. Nevertheless this answer is extant;

[4] *Patrologia latina*, Vol. 77, p. 852.

it is dated 1052, and no doubt was delayed in reaching Antioch. The Pope congratulates him on his promotion to the Episcopate and, after having approved of Peter's profession of faith, sends him his own.

Communication with a newly elected Patriarch having thus been well established, his name was inscribed on the diptychs of the living, who are commemorated in the Canon of the Mass. This list included the names of the Pope, of the four Patriarchs, of many bishops and also of temporal princes. In the Greek Churches it was read from the rood-loft by a deacon. The inscription of the name of a Patriarch on the diptychs of the Canon was then of special import, since the repetition of his name at each liturgical ceremony was a formal proof of his orthodoxy. Erasure from the diptychs was, on the contrary, a sign of schism. Thus the name of Pope Felix III was removed from the diptychs by Acacius, then reinscribed by his successor Euphemius, who in his turn suppressed that of Peter Mongus, the heretical Patriarch of Alexandria. But Felix III refused to recognize Euphemius because he had not also erased the name of Acacius (488).

On the eve of the schism of 1054 this custom was still in force, though it is true that Michael Cerularius in his first letter to Peter of Antioch affirmed that at Constantinople the name of the Pope had not appeared in the diptychs since the Trullan Council of 692. The Patriarch of Antioch had no trouble in refuting this allegation, and declared that during a journey made to Constantinople in his youth, he saw with his own eyes the name of the Pope inscribed on the diptychs.

The exchange of synodal letters and the mention in the diptychs therefore constituted an official recognition of the communion between the Churches. But they had besides affairs to deal with in common, and they felt the need of remaining in touch with each other permanently.

The institution of apocrisiaries (*apocrisiarii responsales*)

provided for this. From the fifth century the Pope and the Patriarchs of the East had permanent agents living at Constantinople, but the institution does not seem to have been recognized till the following century. All the archbishops of any importance on occasion sent apocrisiaries to the Imperial court. In the sixth century we hear of apocrisiaries from Thessalonica and Carthage. But the only ones we have to consider are those of Rome and the Patriarchal Sees who at the time of Justinian lived at the capital in a permanent way. (*Reverendissimi . . . apocrisiarii . . . qui in regis civitate degunt.*)[5]

The institution became regular after the conquest of Rome by Belisarius in 537 and it is possible to draw up a fairly complete list of the Roman apocrisiaries at Constantinople during the sixth and seventh centuries. In 602 in his letter to the Emperor Phocas, Gregory the Great apologizes that the new Emperor has not found in his palace, "in conformity with an ancient custom" a Roman deacon, appointed by the Pope. His excuse is the difficulty in finding available persons who might be acceptable to the Emperor, a *defensor* in this capacity.[6] He adds that he has entrusted the deaconry to him, which proves that at that period the office of apocrisiary was always filled by one of the deacons of the Roman Church. At the same time he mentions the object of its mission, which is to be to keep the "Imperial Clemency" informed on Italian matters.

The pontifical apocrisiary was then a real *Nuncio* to be compared to those of today whose functions embrace both the spiritual and the temporal interests of Rome. The importance of this office is sufficiently illustrated by the fact that several of those who filled it in the sixth century afterwards became Popes—Pelagius in 536, and then from 538 to 545, Vigilius about 537, Gregory the Great from 578 to 586—were all apocrisiaries to the Holy See before their accessions to the Pontificate. The im-

[5]Nov. 23, 25. [6]*Patrologia latina*, Vol. 77, p. 1288.

portance and the complexity of the matters they had to deal with demanded great energy, and we see Pelagius I recall from office Sarpatius the deacon on account of his great age. In his letter the Pope says: "An apocrisiary should not absent himself from the palace for a single hour."[7]

The seat of this permanent nunciature in Constantinople was the Imperial palace of Placidia, situated not far from the Grand Palace, on the actual site of the old Seraglio. The offices of the apocrisiary were there, and there it was that the Popes who came to Constantinople resided. In 547 Vigilius was solemnly conducted there on his arrival, and it was the same with Pope Constantine in 711. There was a private chapel there, and we find the Monothelite Patriarch Paul preventing the apocrisiaries of Pope Martin I from celebrating the liturgy there (649–653).

Side by side with numerous references to a single apocrisiary at Constantinople, we sometimes find the Pope represented by several. Pope Martin I complains of the violence done to "his apocrisiaries." It seems, however, as if the permanent legation had but one incumbent, and that it was only in exceptional cases—during important negotiations, for instance—that the Pope sent several apocrisiaries.[8]

These envoys of the Pope did not, properly speaking, receive a delegation of the Apostolic authority, and their power was entirely distinct from that of Legates. Their duties were limited to watching over the interests of the Holy See and to addressing to it reports or responses—hence their name of *responsales*. Their juridical position is well defined by one of Justinian's Constitutions. Without a special mandate from their bishop, they could not prosecute a case in a Court of Justice in the name of their Church. So too they could not be made defendants as

[7]Grisar, *Histoire des Papes*, Ledos' translation, II, p. 379.
[8]See Pargoire, *Dictionnaire d'Archéologie chrétienne: Apocrisiaire.*

representatives of their bishop, except in the case where he had delegated them to take some legal action.[9] On the other hand they enjoyed no diplomatic immunity, and could be prosecuted if they committed anything reprehensible during their mission.

The apocrisiary was therefore not a real Legate, and for lack of special authority he could not take the place of the Pope in a Council. The apocrisiaries of the Patriarchs of the East were in a similar position. Among other duties devolving on them, a Constitution of Justinian notes their obligation to transmit to the Imperial Chancellor the request for an audience for bishops from the jurisdiction they represented when these came to Constantinople. Moreover, the latter were expected first of all to produce letters from their Metropolitan, authorizing them to take the journey and indicating its motives.

The apocrisiaries were then the principal intermediaries assuring a free play of relations between the Churches. In the seventh century Arabian conquest caused the disappearance of the apocrisiaries from the East. The Popes continued to have an apocrisiary at Constantinople till the controversy on images. In 715, Michael, "apocrisiary of the Apostolic See," is mentioned in the official report of the election of the Patriarch Germanus. Even after the rupture provoked by the Iconoclast edict of 726, Gregory II, Gregory III, Zacharias, and Stephen II several times sent apocrisiaries to Constantinople, but it is plain that they no longer constituted a permanent nunciature.

Was this nunciature ever re-established? From the eighth century onwards we never see apocrisiaries playing any part in religious affairs. We have, however, unimpeachable testimony to prove that at least until the tenth century the Pope and even the Patriarchs of the East did not cease to have official and permanent representatives at Constantinople. In the *Cleotorologion* by Philo-

[9] Nov. 6, 3.

theus written in 900, among the dignitaries who were called to take their places at an Imperial banquet we find "the Syncellus of Rome, the Syncellus of Constantinople, and if they are present, the Syncelli of the Patriarchs of the East, and then the Archbishop of Bulgaria."[10] The syncelli here in question are evidently the successors of the ancient apocrisiaries, and even if the name has been changed, the function must have remained the same. The eminent rank which they occupy in the hierarchy is a certain proof of it. We know too what an important position the syncelli of Constantinople held in religious affairs; many of them eventually became Patriarchs.[11] On the other hand it is natural to suppose that after the reconciliation of 886, the Pope re-established under this name the permanent envoy who represented him at Constantinople.

The apocrisiaries and later the syncelli were, however, appointed to the Emperor and not to the Patriarchs. They were in a way the *chargés d'affaires* of the spiritual power to the imperial government, and we do not see that the Patriarchs had ever thought of maintaining agents of this sort at Rome. Their activity contributed none the less to assure regular intercourse between the Churches, the imperial government being the normal intermediary.

Beside these permanent representatives, whenever important matters came up, and it was a question of carrying on difficult negotiations, or holding Councils, the Popes sent to Constantinople Legates provided with full power, and charged to act in the name of the Apostolic See. The Emperor on his part frequently sent to Rome high dignitaries charged to represent him. These exchanges of ambassadors were continued regularly till the eleventh century, and even the schism did not cause them to cease entirely.

---

[10] *De caerimonis, Patrologia graeca,* Vol. 112, p. 1342.

[11] J. B. Bury, *The Imperial Administrative System in the Ninth Century,* London, 1911, p. 116.

Lastly, it happened repeatedly and in specially difficult circumstances, that several Popes went in person to Constantinople. In 525 Pope John I is charged by Theodoric with a mission to the Emperor. In 536 Agapetus is also sent by Theodoric, and avails himself of the journey to depose the Patriarch Anthimus, who is suspected of Monophysite doctrine. In 545 on the other hand it is Justinian who forces Vigilius to come to Constantinople to settle the question of the Three Chapters. We know what excitements were connected with this stay in the East, which was prolonged till 555. Harassed and persecuted by Justinian, who sent him into exile, the Pope finally signed the condemnation of the Three Chapters and recognized the decrees of the sixth Ecumenical Council. In 654 Pope Martin was carried to Constantinople as a prisoner to answer for his rejection of the *Typus* of Constans. His end was, we know, that of a martyr. When Justinian II was reconciled to the Holy See, he invited Pope Constantine to come to Constantinople in 710, and received him with the greatest honours. In 784 when Irene offered to call an Ecumenical Council for Pope Hadrian to put an end to the iconoclastic heresy, she asked him to come himself to Constantinople, but the the Pope thought it enough to send legates. Later on Gregory VII contemplated following the road his predecessors had taken and going in person to end the schism, but events prevented him from realizing this grandiose project.

Thus we see that a whole group of customs and institutions, in force up to the eve of the schism, provided for the perpetuation of relations between Rome and the Churches of the East. Thanks to this tradition, often broken it is true, but renewed after each crisis, the majority of the questions which might lead to conflict were settled in a peaceful way. An attempt should be made to describe this *modus vivendi*, which was attained by force of good will, and which the schism of the eleventh century called in question.

II

Age-long conflicts which repeatedly arose to disturb the good accord between Rome and the Churches of the East had had for their subjects dogma, the hierarchy, limitation of jurisdictions, dogmatic and disciplinary authority, divergence of customs. Now just before the schism of the eleventh century in each of these domains there had been endeavours to arrive at an understanding, and agreement seemed likely. None of these questions were insoluble; they served as the pretexts for the schism, but were not its underlying cause.

With regard to dogma in particular an understanding was easy, since as a matter of fact, there has never been any fundamental divergence between that of the East and the West. The great disputes in the fifth and sixth centuries on the subject of the Trinity and Christology were primarily between the Churches of the East. The Popes intervened simply as arbitrators, and to uphold threatened orthodoxy. Dogmatic agreement was realized by the six first Ecumenical Councils and the creed called Constantinopolitan, a resetting of the Nicean, became the expression of a common faith.

This creed, which appears to have come from Jerusalem, where it may have been used as the profession of faith in baptism, appears after 374 in the *Ancoratus* of St. Epiphanius, and was perhaps adopted by the Fathers at the Council of Constantinople in 381. It was officially recognized by the Council of Chalcedon in 451, and Justinian inserted it at the beginning of the *Code* in a rescript addressed to the Patriarch in 533. At this time it was adopted at Rome as the baptismal creed in place of the Apostles' Creed, to which, however, Rome reverted as early as the eighth century. Thus the Constantinopolitan Creed became the most complete expression of Orthodoxy, and it was for this reason that it was introduced into the liturgy. We owe this innovation to the Mono-

physites, Peter the Fuller, Patriarch of Antioch (450–488) and Timothy, Patriarch of Constantinople in 511, who both wished to combat the last adherents of the heresy of Macedonius. All the Eastern Churches adopted this use, and the Council of Toledo of 589 following their example prescribed the recitation of this creed at Mass in the churches of Spain. This practice, however, spread very slowly through the west. In Rome in the ninth century it was the custom to recite this creed in Greek, but it was only by a decision of Benedict VIII in 1014 that its recitation became obligatory in the liturgy.

It is therefore possible to say that the same profession of faith unites the East and the West. The dogmatic agreement realized by the first six Councils was renewed at Nicea in 787. The doctrine of images which prevailed at this Council doubtless found many opponents, but the controversy which broke out on this subject at the beginning of the ninth century did not touch the foundations of the dogma. It was from another side that danger came. At the moment when the Constantinopolitan Creed, sung, recited in all the Churches of Christendom, seemed to have become the rallying sign of the Orthodox, the quarrel arose about the *Filioque*, and dogmatic controversies between Greeks and Latins began.

This celebrated question is not simply a dispute about words, but as has been shown, it reveals in reality two somewhat different conceptions of the relations between the persons of the Holy Trinity. To be sure, neither of the solutions would have imperilled the dogma of the Trinity itself. That was doubtless the reason why the Popes for some time appeared indifferent to the question, and exerted themselves to prevent its becoming a ground for disagreement. It may be well briefly to recall the facts.

The double procession of the Holy Spirit, admitted by St. Ambrose and St. Augustine, was recognized at the Council of Toledo in 447, but was not an occasion of

dispute until the beginning of the ninth century. In 806 some Latin monks of the Mount of Olives were accused of heresy by Greek monks of St. Sabas, for having added the *Filioque* to the Creed. They appealed to the Pope declaring that they sang the Creed as they had heard it sung at Aix-la-Chapelle by the clergy of the Imperial Chapel. The Council of Aix-la-Chapelle (809) confirmed this, but the Pope refused to make the innovation at Rome, leaving the question unsettled.

It was not therefore impossible to attempt to find a basis of agreement when in 876 in his encyclical letter to the Bishops of the East, Photius, resolved on schism, declared the addition of the *Filioque* to be rank heresy and made this question the centre of his attacks against the Latins. The Western Church responded to his *Treatise on the Procession of the Holy Spirit* by similar works, and then began the irritating and sterile controversy which was to follow the same round even to the fifteenth century. And yet the Popes were always disposed to be conciliatory, as appears from one significant fact. In 879 Methodius, the Apostle of the Slavs, was accused by the Bishops of the German Church of not chanting the Creed in conformity with the text adopted by the Church. On being called to Rome, Methodius showed that he sang the Creed as it was sung at Rome, that is to say, without the *Filioque*. In his letter to the Slav Prince Svatopluk (June, 880), Pope John VIII recognized that Methodius sang the Creed in conformity with the faith of the Roman Church.[12]

It is even possible to go further and to show that immediately before the schism of the eleventh century the Popes had not renounced this tolerance. We know that in 1052 the Patriarch of Antioch sent his profession of faith to Leo IX. In his letter of 1053 the Pope approves it and returns his own, in which he professes the double Procession of the Holy Spirit. It is, however, not prob-

[12]Leger, *Cyrille et Méthode*, Paris, 1868, p. 141.

able that Peter of Antioch, who later expressed his horror of the *Filioque*, had done the same. Yet the Pope entirely approves of his *Synodicon*, and finds nothing to reprove.

It is remarkable too that this question which had held such an important place in the Photian polemics should have been barely touched upon and recalled as it were as a mere matter of record by Michael Cerularius in the controversy of 1054. Neither the letter of Leo of Achrida to the Bishop of Trani, nor the first treatise of Nicetas Pectoratus, nor the letter of Peter of Antioch to the Patriarch of Grado, nor those of Michael Cerularius to Peter of Antioch nor the replies of Humbert to Nicetas, nor the letter in which Leo IX enumerates all the heresies of the Greeks makes the least allusion to it. Nor does the subject seem to have been discussed during the stay of the Legates at Constantinople. Moreover, one fact shows how near the Greeks were, in spite of the intransigent form of their protestations, to coming to terms with the Latins. In a treatise that Michael Psellus wrote for the education of the future Emperor Michael Ducas, he begins with a statement of the faith, and affirms that "the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and is communicated to us by the Son." ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς μὲν ἐκπορευόμενον, δι 'Υἱόν δὲ μεταδιδόμενον.[13] Here was a basis for an understanding if they had desired it and we may conclude that at the time of the eleventh century no dogmatic divergence of a grave nature separated the Latins and the Greeks.

But, as has often been shown, differences revealed themselves in another order of questions. To what degree could the Churches of the East reconcile their autonomy to the Roman authority? Such was the real heart of the struggle, such was the cause of the rupture. But even here we may ask, was the schism inevitable, and were not efforts made to establish an understanding?

[13] *Patrologia graeca*, Vol. 122, p. 688.

It should be noted at the outset that before and even after the schism of 1054 the precedence of honour of the See of St. Peter never ceased to be recognized by the Greeks. Of this there are abundant proofs. It suffices to recall that the ecclesiastical hierarchy was officially sanctioned by the laws of Justinian. Constitution 131 decides that according to the authority of the Councils "the Holy Pope of Ancient Rome is the first of all the priests; that the Blessed Archbishop of Constantinople, the second Rome, comes next in rank after the Holy Apostolic See of Ancient Rome." There is nothing to show that this state law was ever abrogated even after the schism. Other Constitutions enumerated the Patriarchs in the following order—Rome, Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch, Jerusalem.[14] It is the same in all episcopal notices, in all the articles on ecclesiastical geography written by Greeks of different periods.

On their side the Popes after long resistance had in the sixth century at last decided to recognize the hierarchy of the five Patriarchs, while at the same time affirming their own pre-eminence. The struggle then was solely on the title "Ecumenical," which the Patriarch of Constantinople had assumed in the sixth century. On this point the Pope proved inflexible, and he also refused to recognize the right of the See of Constantinople to the double qualification of "Apostolic" and "Universal." That there was, however, in Rome a party disposed to conciliation is shown by the curious observations of Anastasius the Librarian, in his preface to the records of the eighth Ecumenical Council. He states that when he was in Constantinople and was discussing the subject of the disputed title with certain Greeks, he learnt from them that as they understood it the word "ecumenical" did not signify "universal," but simply "general," indicating an authority over a portion of the world inhabited by Christians.[15]

[14]Nov. 109, 123, 3. [15]Mansi, *Concilia XII*, 982.

Pontifical primacy was asserted in the Ecumenical Councils over which Roman Legates presided, even when the Emperor was present. Further, they were the first to sign the records of the Councils. At the end of the ninth century, when the *Cletorologion* of Philotheus was drawn up, we see that in the Imperial Hierarchy the Syncellus of Rome comes before the Syncelli of Constantinople, and the other Eastern Patriarchs. The same work states that "the envoys of Rome if they are bishops take precedence of the bishops of our Church, and the same with priests." It adds that in 886 Bishop Nicholas and Cardinal John, envoys sent to re-establish the unity of the Church, took their places before the order of the *magistri*—that is to say, before the first of the Byzantine dignitaries.[16] It may be said, in spite of the desires of certain Patriarchs and their endeavours to gain recognition as equally powerful with the Holy See of Rome, that the pre-eminence of the Pope was never seriously questioned.

The question of the limits of jurisdiction had also roused discussion between Rome and Constantinople. The disputed territory was ancient Illyricum, comprising Macedonia, Epirus, Illyria and Greece. Up to the fifth century these provinces were under the Roman Patriarchate. The law of Theodosius II of 421, which placed them under the authority of the Patriarch of Constantinople, was not put in effect, and Justinian formally acknowledged the rights of the Pope over Illyricum. It was the iconoclastic Emperors, Leo the Isaurian, and Constantine V, who deprived the Pope of his jurisdiction, not only over Illyricum, but over Sicily and the south of Italy to transfer it to the Patriarch of Constantinople.

In spite of protests, repeatedly expressed, the Popes never recovered this jurisdiction. By the ninth century they seem to have resigned themselves to the loss of Illyricum in order to concentrate their efforts on Southern

[16] *Patrologia graeca*, Vol. 112, pp. 1353–1355.

Italy. But even here they failed, and in Calabria the Emperors Leo VI and Nicephorus Phocas in succession organized on their own initiative a purely Greek hierarchy, strictly subjected to Constantinople. The struggle for influence continued in these regions till the schism of 1054, of which it was one of the determining causes.[17]

Conflicts on the subject of jurisdiction were often complicated by disputes as to propaganda. For instance in Bulgaria Prince Boris, who had been baptized by a Greek bishop in 865, sent an embassy to the Pope the following year asking him for an autonomous archbishop. Nicholas I sent Formosus, Bishop of Porto, who organized the Bulgarian Church, but was recalled to Rome in 867. Dissatisfied with the Pope, Boris turned to Constantinople. In 870 the Patriarch Ignatius, who had just regained possession of his See with the help of Roman Legates, sent him Archbishop Joseph, who took possession of the country and drove out the Latin missionaries. Pope John VIII prepared to act against Ignatius, but when the Legates arrived at Constantinople, the Patriarch was dead and Photius, restored, promised to abandon Bulgaria. But Boris disregarded his promises. Bulgaria continued attached to the Patriarchate of Constantinople. When in the eleventh century Basil II had completely conquered the country, he replaced the Bulgarian Patriarch by a suffragan Archbishop of Constantinople, and by his Constitution of 1020 reorganized the Bulgarian dioceses.

The Popes in no way hindered the propaganda of the Greek Church among the Slavs, rather they were its chief patrons, and we know that Nicholas, Adrian II, and later on John VIII, promoted the work of Cyril and Methodius, the Apostles of the Slavs, and repeatedly protected them from the spiteful intrigues of German bishops. Adrian II received the apostles at Rome in 868, consecrated Constantine Bishop of Moravia, giving him the name of Cyril,

[17]See Gay, *L'Italie Méridionale et l'empire Byzantine*, Paris, 1904, pp. 185, 350, 495.

ordained to priest's or deacon's orders his principal followers, and in spite of the opposition of the greater number of Roman bishops, approved his translation of the Scriptures into the Slavic tongue, and authorized it to be used in the liturgy. No example can illustrate better the spirit of conciliation which at times animated the two Churches. That Cyril, originally a priest of Constantinople and a follower of Photius, should come to put his apostolic work under the protection of the Pope, and the reception accorded by the Pope to the Apostles of the Slavs are facts equally remarkable. Later John VIII, influenced by German bishops, forbade Methodius to employ the Slavic tongue, but the saint, summoned to Rome in 879 to clear himself of accusations brought against him, had no difficulty in convincing the Pope, and obtained complete satisfaction from him.

But the Pope was not merely the first of the five Patriarchs. It was not enough for him to see his primacy of honour and the boundaries of his Patriarchal jurisdiction recognized. He claimed besides, in the name of the promises made by Christ to St. Peter, whose successor he was, to exercise a controlling power, dogmatic as well as disciplinary, over the whole Church. To what degree was this power accepted by the Churches of the East before the schism?

It may be said that this double authority of the Pope seemed to form such an integral part of the constitution of the Church that it was accepted outright up to the eleventh century.

The universal power of the Pope is acknowledged repeatedly in magnificent terms in the homilies of John Chrysostom, one of the most illustrious Patriarchs of Constantinople. He frequently recurs to the idea that it is not to one single see, but to the entire universe that Jesus has given Peter as its "Doctor."[18] Moreover, the

[18]Jugie, *St. Jean Chrysostome et la Primauté de Pierre. Echos d'Orient*, 1908, p. 1.

legislation of Justinian, which was never abrogated at Constantinople, formally recognizes the double authority of the Pope. At the head of the *Code* he places the constitution of 380, by which the Emperors Gratian, Valentinian and Theodosius command the people of the Empire to follow the religion that the Apostle Peter transmitted to the Romans.[19] In 533 he addresses to Pope John II his profession of faith which he inserts in the *Code* with the Pontiff's reply. He denounces to the Pope heretical sects that rise up against those priests who firmly maintain the doctrine of the Pope. In other constitutions he calls Rome the land of laws, the source of priesthood.

Further he claims to reconcile this doctrine with strictures that he has made on certain of the Popes. In a message informing the Fathers of the Fifth Council that Pope Vigilius had separated himself from the Catholic communion, he added that he nevertheless remained united to the Apostolic See, thus distinguishing between the person of the Pope and the Roman Church.[20]

It may be said that from the sixth to the eleventh century the dogmatic interventions of the Popes never ceased in the East, and in the end their doctrine always prevailed. Even the caesaropapism of the Emperors always began with obeisance to them. The theological Emperors Justinian, Constantine, Heraclius, Leo the Isaurian after the edict condemning images, always sought to gain the Pope for their projects, and only acted contrary to him when they found him inflexible. It is clear that if the dogmatic power of the Pope had been formally denied by the Greeks, they would not have taken so many precautions.

It was the same in disciplinary matters. The intervention of the Pope in this domain undoubtedly often met with resistance, and gave rise to schisms such as those of Acacius and Photius, but its legitimacy was never seriously questioned till 1054. The best homage that its

[19]Cod. I, 1,1. [20]Mansi, *Concilia*, IX, p. 367.

principal adversaries have rendered the papacy is that they have almost always begun by provoking it, and rejected it when its judgments were unfavourable to them. So it was when Photius, after his elevation to the Patriarchate, sent envoys to the Pope to gain recognition for the legitimacy of his authority (860).

But further, the Pope believed he had the right to intervene in certain cases of discipline within the Churches of the East, and the numerous appeals to Rome that are found in the ecclesiastical history of the East seem to justify this pretension. It is true that the Greek Church chafed under this intervention, but it was always provoked by one of its own members. A characteristic example in this respect is found at the beginning of the Patriarchate of Ignatius in 847. Gregory Asvestas, Archbishop of Syracuse, condemned by the Patriarchal Synod for certain irregularities, appealed to Pope Leo IV, who requested Ignatius to send him the documents concerning the case. The Patriarch refused. Benedict III, the successor of Leo IV in 855, on his part did not consent to ratify the deposition of Gregory, but suspended him till he was more amply informed in the matter.

In reality three different attitudes towards the question of the authority of the Pope are to be found in the Greek Church. At the time of the dispute on images Theodore of Studion and his followers saw in the authority of the See of St. Peter the necessary counterbalance to official caesaropapism; according to them, the Pope alone can assure to the Church the liberty that is indispensable to it in dealing with temporal princes and that permits it to exercise its divine mission to the faithful. The Studite party prolonged its existence until the eleventh century, it opposed Photius, and it is not without interest to note that the Studite monk, Nicetas Pectoratus, who had written the *Treatise on the Azymites* by order of Michael Cerularius, submitted without resistance to the Legates

of Rome in 1054. The greater number of the Greek clergy, however, though they did not contest the Pope's right of intervention, regarded it as a last resource, only to be employed in difficult questions, and to be rarely exercised. This moderate view represents in short the *modus vivendi* which had become established between Rome and the Greek Church. And finally from the time of the schism of Photius a third party had formed which admitted in no case the intervention of the Pope. In his letter to the Patriarch of Antioch, Michael Cerularius says that what he has found most intolerable in the Legates of the Pope is that they did not come to discuss, but to convince him and to impose their own dogmas on him. In his letter to the Patriarch of Grado, Peter of Antioch, while praising the piety of the Western Church, complains that in one point it is an object of offence to other Churches. "The Head of the one Church, the Blessed Pope of Rome," he says, "no longer consents to walk in concord and come to agreement with the other Patriarchs on the subject of the mysteries, he alone is arrogant, he alone desires to win the recognition of his own special will."

Indeed if the Pope did regard his right of intervention as incontestable, he exercised it but very rarely and when he was solicited to do so by the Greeks themselves. The autonomy of the Greek Church was very extended. Several times we see the Emperor modifying the episcopal boundaries without reference to the Pope, and without any protest from him. The schism was desired by a minority only, and the majority of the Greek bishops were very willing to adapt themselves to the *modus vivendi* which had grown up in the course of the centuries.

In short the principal grievances brought forward by the authors of the schism of 1054 concerned questions of usage: unleavened bread for the Host, Saturday fasts, celibacy of priests, suppression of the "Alleluia" during Lent, and so on. The Greeks even went so far as to

reproach the Roman clergy for shaving their beards. This intransigence of the Greek Church for customs not its own appeared already at the Trullan Council of 691. If the Popes refused to approve of the acts of this Council, which prescribed the customs of the Greeks for all Christian Churches, we do not find that they ever condemned them. If they rejected the unification desired by Constantinople, it was not to substitute for it that of Rome. In numerous cases showing the contrary we see how they respected the particular customs of the Greeks. If it is true, as Luitprand, whose witness is doubted, asserts, that Nicephorus Phocas forbade the use of the Latin tongue in the liturgy in the dioceses of Calabria and Apulia, this action may be contrasted with that of the Popes who gave to the Greek language a place in the Roman liturgy. In the sixth century at Rome, when a child was brought to baptism, the acolyte asked: In what tongue does he confess our Lord Jesus Christ? According to the answer the Creed was repeated in Greek or Latin.[21] In some towns of the south of Italy, Greek and Latin clergy were in the habit of celebrating certain festivals together. It was the same in Rome in the eighth century, and later in the Church at Naples.[22]

We hear with what broad-mindedness the Popes of the ninth century accepted the Slavic liturgy of St. Cyril and St. Methodius, in spite of the opposition of the Western Episcopate. Not only were the customs of the Greeks no stumbling-block to the Latins, but we see in 1054 how Cardinal Humbert, one of the Legates, in his treatise against simoniacs, praises certain customs of the Greek Church saying: "The laity has never as in the West had the disposal of ecclesiastical benefices."[23] No field for an understanding could have been more favorable, if the Greeks, jealous with good reason for autonomy in their

[21]Grisar, *Histoire des Papes*, II, p. 362.
[22]Gay, *L'Italie méridionale et l'empire Byzantin*, p. 188.
[23]*Patrologia latina*, Vol. 143, p. 1151.

usages, had consented to respect those of the Churches of the West. One of the first manifestations of the hostility of Michael Cerularius against the Holy See was on the subject of the closing of the Latin Churches in Constantinople. Neither the Popes nor the Western bishops ever thought of employing reprisals, and yet there were many Greek Churches in Rome and throughout Italy. Indeed when *rapprochement* was attempted between the two Churches the question of customs never caused any difficulty, and the Popes gave the Greek rite its place in the universal Church.

III

So far we have dealt especially with the relations of the heads of the ecclesiastical hierarchy to each other. To know in any real way the mutual feelings that stirred the Greeks and the Latins we must turn to the faithful as a body. The evidence which we possess of their intercourse with each other previous to the schism shows us that far from disliking and excommunicating each other, they regarded one another as members of the same Church. Certainly the schism was not of their choosing.

The prosperity of Greeks and Orientals in Italy through the Middle Ages is a well-established fact. Leaving aside Sicily and the south of Italy, which may be considered Hellenized territory, we find at Rome from the sixth century a Greek colony, which doubtless diminished in importance after the decline of Byzantine rule, but which never entirely disappeared. When St. Blasius, originally of Amorium, came to Rome in 866 with Bulgarian ambassadors, he was received in a Greek monastery dedicated to St. Cesarius, whose abbot, Eustratus, was born at Cyzicus,[24] and he remained there several years.

Early in the eleventh century the history of St. Nilus, the ascetic of Rossano, shows us the cordiality of the rela-

[24]Loparev, *Vie des Saints grecs des VIII et IX siècles. Vizantijskij Vremennik*, XIX, p. 116.

tions between the monks and the faithful of the two rites. Obliged to flee from his monastery before a Saracen invasion, he was received at Monte Cassino with the same honours as if he were "the great St. Benedict risen from the dead." The Abbot invited him to take up his residence at the monastery with sixty of his monks. In response to this courtesy he composed a hymn in honour of St. Benedict. The monks having asked his opinion about fasting on Saturday, he replied that the customs of the Greeks and the Latins were equally good, and that each should follow the example of his Fathers. At Rome he was received by the Pope and the Emperor Otto III with the highest honours. At last towards the year 1004 he founded near Tusculum the abbey of Grottaferrata, which has preserved its Basilian rite through the centuries as a living symbol of the unity between Greeks and Latins. St. Bartholomew, one of the abbots succeeding St. Nilus was to be among the most trusted counsellors of Gregory VII.

There is much evidence to show that before the schism Greek and Eastern Christians had preserved a great veneration for Rome, the see of the successor of St. Peter. It is enough to recall the story, so characteristic, of the removal of the relics of Pope St. Clement, which were carried to Rome from distant Kherson by Cyril and Methodius, the apostles of the Slavs. The interest even of those in Constantinople in the relics from Kherson is illustrated by the fact that the hagiographer, Constantine of Thessalonica, desirous of obtaining the title *philosophos*, composed a discourse on the *Discovery of the Relics of Pope St. Clement.*[25] We have besides evidence that a pilgrimage to the tombs of the Apostles St. Peter and St. Paul was regarded by the Eastern Church as a meritorious act. Early in the ninth century it was Michael, Syncellus to the Patriarch Thomas of Jerusalem, who undertook a journey to Rome to worship at the tombs of the Apostles, and to submit to

[25]Loparev, *Viz. Vrem.* XIX, 147.

the Pope the question of the *Filioque*.[26] In 850 the Georgian monk Hilarion, after having visited Jerusalem and Constantinople, came to Rome and stayed two years.[27] In 895 Eli the Young, the ascetic of Calabria, after having visited all the sanctuaries of Christendom, came to Rome with Daniel, his follower, and his biographer mentions that he was received by the Pope with honour.[28] Even in the eleventh century, just before the schism, St. Christodulus started from Asia Minor to visit the tombs of the Apostles (1043). And not monks alone, but laymen, Byzantine officials, went on this pilgrimage, for example, John the Scholastic, spoken of in the life of St. Bartholomew, went to Rome in 1045.[29] St. Simeon, one of the many travelling monks of the time, a native of Armenia, was not satisfied with visiting Rome, but we hear of him successively in the principal sanctuaries of the West, at St. James of Compostelle, at St. Martin of Tours, even in England. He finally established himself in a monastery at Mantua where he died in 1016. Another St. Simeon, originally of Syracuse, educated at Constantinople, then a monk on Sinai, after a series of romantic adventures took up his dwelling in a cell which he had had built in the ruins of the Porta Nigra of Trèves. Towards the end of the tenth century William of St. Benignus at Dijon had several Greeks among his disciples, one of whom had been Bishop of Corinth. At the close of the ninth century Macarius, Bishop of Antioch in Pisidia, took refuge in the Flemish monastery of St. Amandus. He died there, was canonized after his death, and his biography was written by two monks of St. Amandus.

It is clear that if feelings of real defiance had separated Greeks and Latins, their relations would have been less

---

[26]Loparev, *Viz. Vrem.* XVII, 215.
[27]Ib. p. 56.
[28]Loparev, *Viz. Vrem.* XIX, p. 135.
[29]*Patrologia graeca*, Vol. 127, p. 488.

cordial. Since the ninth century large numbers of people from the West had also travelled to the Orient to trade or to make pilgrimages to the Holy Places. All accounts of their journeyings testify to the kind welcome they received from the Greeks and other peoples of the Orient. Most of the pilgrims followed the course of the Danube, passing on through Constantinople, the churches and celebrated relics of which excited their admiration. In 1026 we see one of them, Richard, the Abbot of St. Vanne in Lorraine, received by the Emperor and by the Patriarch Alexis, who made him a present of two fragments of the Holy Cross. Pilgrims of lesser degree received as warm a welcome, and *The Miracles of St. Faith* tells us the story of a Saracen, who after being miraculously delivered from his prison by the intervention of the saint, made a pilgrimage to Conques in Rouergue (Aveyron), and passing through Constantinople with the Aquitanian who had freed him went to relate his adventures to the Emperor.

Latin establishments also existed in the East before the schism. Those in Jerusalem were destroyed by the Caliph Hakim in 1009 with the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, but they were soon rebuilt. Even in Constantinople several churches and monasteries of the Latin rite existed, among which we may name St. Mary of the Amalfitans, founded by the celebrated family of Mauro; St. Stephen, founded under Basil II by St. Stephen, king of Hungary; and the church assigned to the soldiers of the Varangian Guard, composed of Scandinavians and Anglo-Saxons.

What is still more significant is the fact that the faithful of Latin rite took monastic orders at Mount Athos or Sinai. Some merchants of Amalfi even founded a monastery on Mount Athos which was filled with their compatriots.

Finally if all this evidence were wanting one other fact would suffice to prove that no insuperable estrangement separated the faithful of the two rites, namely, the profound influence now just beginning to be appreciated,

which the Greeks and Orientals exercised on the religious life, the ecclesiastical literature and the religious art of the West up to the eleventh century. To attempt to draw even an incomplete picture of these exchanges would be a long task. It may suffice to mention some of the many saints the adoration of whom originated in the East before it spread in the West;—the Archangel St. Michael, St. Anne and all the saints who are purely Greek—St. Theodore, St. Sergius, Sts. Cosmas and Damian, and St. Nicholas whose relics, brought over by the monks, gave birth to sanctuaries. We know what an important part apocryphal literature played in the development of religious iconography. This originated in the East. The better one understands the religious art of the Middle Ages, the more one perceives how much of its inspiration it owes to the important influence of the ascetic literature of the Byzantine Orient. To give but one example, it is certainly to the East that we must turn to find the first expression of the compassionate lamentation of the Holy Virgin (Pietà) which was to renew the inspiration of Western art towards the end of the Middle Ages, and give it a pathetic and mystic character.

Even if we confine ourselves to the period of the schism, we know how Byzantine art developed in Italy in the eleventh century, and today we can admire at Amalfi, at Salerno, at Mount St. Angelo, at St. Paul Outside the Walls some of the magnificent bronze gates executed in the workshops of Constantinople, with which the Mauros and the Pantaleones of Amalfi adorned Italian sanctuaries. It was at the same period that Abbot Didier applied to Greeks to beautify the monastery of Monte Cassino.[30]

This is not the place to insist on these religious and artistic relations but the fact of their existence is of great interest to us. They enable us to affirm that far from feeling themselves estranged, the Greeks and the Latins

[30]See Bertaux, *L'art Byzantin dans l'Italie méridionale*, Paris, 1904, p. 158, sq.

of the Middle Ages regarded themselves as united in the same faith, and enjoyed a communion of the same religious ideal. Nearly a century had passed after the schism, and many consciences had not yet resigned themselves to the irreparable. It was in 1143 that Roger, the great king of Sicily, had made for his Palatine chapel at Palermo the wonderful mosaics which today witness to the breadth of his faith. In the medallions which ornament the nave we may see the great saints of the Greek Church alternately with those of the Latin rite: St. Gregory of Nyssa, St. Gregory of Nazianzus, St. Basil, St. John Chrysostom following St. Ambrose, St. Augustine, St. Sylvester and St. Gregory the Great. No monument better shows the mutual respect which, despite events, the Latins and the Greeks had preserved for each other.

The schism which tore their consciences was therefore not desired by the faithful, but was thrust upon them by politicians. After centuries of terrible convulsion, the Churches of the West and the East had succeeded in establishing between themselves a *régime* of concord which had not arrived at perfection, but was susceptible of continuance and of improvement. A number of customs, traditions and practices assured normal and peaceful relations between them; in most of those domains in which their interests might have been opposed, they had arrived at compromises; the autonomy of the Churches of the East was not incompatible with the dogmatic and disciplinary authority of the Holy See, and lastly the varied relations between the faithful might have become the best pledge of their union. If the question had remained a religious one, the accord would have become definitive. Unhappily the ambitions of the Patriarch Michael Cerularius ran counter to the intransigent inflexibility of the Legates of Leo IX and nothing remained possible but the schism.

The Crisis of the Church

By W. P. Paterson, D.D.,
Professor of Divinity in the University of Edinburgh.

The normal condition of the Church, paradoxical as it sounds, is to be passing through a crisis. There is a chronic crisis in its relations with the world, since it is the witness to truths which contradict the wisdom of the world, and the custodian of ideals which challenge its practice. In the heart of the world there is at least an instinctive enmity towards the Church, which, according to the Fourth Gospel, deepens into hatred, and which disposes it sometimes to persecute the Church, sometimes rather to try to poison it or to smother it. The internal condition of the Church has been responsible for another series of crisis. Although we believe it to be divine in origin, and divine as the seat of a supernatural life, there has always been enough of human nature in the Christian Society to promise that its worst foes will be they of its own household. Between the Church as it exists in idea—as the temple of truth and holiness, and the home of love—and the Church as it exists in fact, with many downward tendencies, there has been a persistent contrast which has given to the situation at almost every stage the character of a crisis. It has also been no uncommon experience for the Church to be involved at one time in a twofold crisis, so that while its relations with the world were strained to the breaking-point, it was simultaneously afflicted with internal weakness and decay, and torn by domestic strife. It is therefore superficial to try to laugh good people out of the belief that their lines have fallen

in an ominously critical period, by reminding them that in every generation other good people have passed the same despondent judgment, and have expressed the same fears. The succession of complainants have been nearer the truth than those who dwelt at ease in Zion, and proclaimed that all was well because things had seldom if ever been well.

But while it lies in the nature of the case that the position of the Church is always more or less critical, there have been at least three periods in which the crisis became extraordinarily acute. The first occurred in the period of its youth, when the organized Paganism of the Graeco-Roman world recognized in the Christian Church an enemy which it tried to destroy by physical force, and when also it was convulsed by fierce and prolonged controversies as to the precise nature of the gift which God had made to the world in the mission of the incarnate Son. A second formidable crisis came to a head in the fifteenth century. By this time fairly friendly relations had been established, through considerable compromises on both sides, between the Church and the world; and this upheaval had the character of a civil war, in which the Western Church was rent in twain, and the conflicting gospels of Roman Catholicism and Protestantism were formulated for the consolation and the distraction of the world. The third crisis, which dates from about the beginning of the eighteenth century, has persisted through several vicissitudes of ebb and flow, and in some respects the conditions have even changed for the worse, if also to some extent for the better, in the most recent times.

The modern crisis has developed both in the internal and in the external relations of the Church. Its inner life has not wholly lost its ancient note of power, but the evidences of power have been accompanied by many marks of weakness. Nothing has been done, or even seriously attempted, to heal the breach between the Greek and Latin Churches, or to reconcile the two divi-

sions of Western Christendom, while the Anglican Church has more and more detached itself from the Protestant Churches without being successful in getting itself welcomed as a fully accredited member of the Catholic circle. The Reformed Churches, narrowly so-called, continued the process of sub-division, partly on doctrinal, partly on politico-ecclesiastical grounds; and the Lutheran church, though less disposed to schism, was the scene of equally violent controversies on the vital questions of the seat of religious authority, and the permanent content of the Christian Creed. And while the Church was thus haunted by the memories of former feuds, and engrossed in newer theological and ecclesiastical issues, there emerged an equally grave crisis in its relations with the world, of which it had so long undertaken the spiritual tutelage. The European and American nations continued to rank as the domain of Christendom, but at the heart of Christendom there developed an intellectual, a political, an economic, and even an ethical life, which valued somewhat lightly its ties with the Church, was disposed to ignore when it did not dispute its claims, and at the best offered it toleration and good-humoured patronage instead of heart-felt affection and reverent obedience in the Lord.

The aspect of the modern crisis which we propose chiefly to discuss is that affecting the external relations of the Church—the lowering of its prestige, and the loosening of its hold upon the world. Although it is not a new thing, as has been indicated, that the relations between the Church and the world should be seriously strained, there are at least two features which are distinctive of the tension of the modern situation. One is that the world has not given effect to its animus—or at least has done so only in small parts of the field, and in comparatively mild ways—by the crude method of persecution. It has shown contempt rather than hatred, and on the whole it has shown indifference rather than con-

tempt. The second special feature is that the alienation from the Church has been rooted in a great variety of motives. In earlier periods there was offered with great assurance the single and simple explanation that all opposition to the Church and its doctrine was rooted in human depravity, which repelled evil livers from the Society which possesses the beauty of sanctity, and which led them to fabricate or to embrace doctrines which were only worthy of blinded minds. And no doubt it has continued to be true, as in the beginning, that there are many who dislike the Church because they prefer the world, and who love darkness rather than light because their deeds are evil. But the peculiar fact of the modern situation has been that the movement away from the Church, and from its doctrine, is due in large measure to impulses and aims which are not merely respectable, but are rooted in the better side of human nature, and which can even claim the benediction of the Kingdom of God. In addition to the offence of the wicked, which has its spring in human depravity, and its consequent affliction of blindness, we must distinguish the offence of the wise, who plead as their animating motive the love of truth, the offence of the earnest who profess to be repelled by the failure of the Church to satisfy their highest convictions of what the Church should reach in life and achievement, and the offence of the multitude which complains that the Church has not met the legitimate demands which it makes upon it for help and consolation. In these divisions there is inevitably some overlapping, but it will be practically convenient to adopt them for the guidance of our discussion—to ask what, from the point of view of the wise, the earnest, and the multitude respectively is the case against the Church, to reply to their criticisms so far as they are unjust, and to consider, so far as they are well-founded, what is needed to remove stumbling-blocks out of the way, and to renew and increase the Church's powers of service.

I

THE OFFENCE OF THE WISE

There has been a marked, and perhaps a widening breach between the intellect of the modern world and the scheme of doctrine which forms the theoretical basis of the Christian Society. While the theory of the Middle Ages and of the early Protestant period was that the doctrines of revealed religion are divine supplements of the highest human knowledge, and assured truths with which all natural discoveries have to be harmonized, the intellectual work of recent times has proceeded on the footing that no power is entitled to foreclose the results of research, and that if the thinking and the conclusions of the modern intellect come into collision with theology it is the Church with its doctrine which must yield pride of place. This tension has been specially manifest in connection with four departments of the higher intellectual activities of the modern world.

1. The history of modern Philosophy, regarded from an ecclesiastical point of view, is a very striking and also a somewhat disquieting phenomenon. How came it, it may be wondered, that there grew up in the midst of Christendom, where even Protestant Churches vied with Roman Catholicism in their sweeping denunciations of "free thought," a school which had free thought for its principle and element? The explanation is that in the earlier stage it was supposed it could do no harm, and was of some use to Theology, if thinkers should apply themselves to find out what might be known through the unaided powers of reason concerning God, and the duty and destiny of man. It was felt that there were in this field subjects of real importance, not cleared up by Revelation, which might be illuminated by the light of nature; and in particular it was assumed that Reason, when it had completed its task of giving a rational proof of the existence of God, would humbly resort to Revela-

tion for fuller and better assured knowledge as to the being and attributes of God, and the conditions of man's salvation. But it soon appeared that Philosophy had no mind to fill the rôle of the mere *ancilla Theologiae*, and to disparage its independent attainments. It began by resolving tentatively to doubt of all that was commonly believed, proceeded to stir the deepest questions, raised more difficulties than it solved, and disseminated sharply conflicting views as to the range of man's powers of knowing, and as to the knowledge which the mind succeeds in attaining. It audaciously raised the question whether the mind really possessed the strength of grasp and powers of flight with which it was credited. The examination of the mind as the instrument of knowledge led to the great cleavage of opinion represented by Empiricism and philosophical Rationalism. According to one principle the whole materials of knowledge are collected through the senses, according to the other Reason, though working with the data of experience, is the source of at least the more valuable elements of knowledge. Where the empirical method was loyally followed out the view of existence issued in Naturalism and Agnosticism. When the path of Rationalism has been preferred, and courage has been taken to affirm that the mind has the title and the competence to transcend the world of phenomena, there has been a further division of opinion as to the nature of the underlying and ultimate reality which it affirms. Some have reverted to the doctrine of Materialism in spite of the overwhelming difficulties by which it is beset from the side of the Theory of Knowledge. Repelled by these difficulties the main body of philosophical thinkers have turned to spirit as giving a likelier clue to the nature of the principle which is manifested in the Universe. But this measure of agreement has only served as the starting-point of a new and far-reaching conflict. It is open to argument whether, if God be Spirit, He is to be construed as per-

sonal or impersonal Spirit, and as a fact the suffrages of the most influential voices of modern philosophy have been divided between the theistic and the pantheistic view of existence.

It is, now, undoubtedly a serious fact that the pure intellect of the civilized world, after taking or receiving permission to do the most strenuous and untrammelled thinking upon the deepest problems of knowing and being, should have given a large measure of currency to theories and systems which are in irreconcilable conflict with the basis of Christian thought. But on the other hand there are considerations which make it possible to regard this movement of thought without panic and even without over-much perturbation. To begin with, the ordeal created by modern Philosophy is not a novel experience for the Church. All systems which have laid their spell on the modern mind were known in principle in the Graeco-Roman world; and though it is true that in modern times the principles of the Sceptical Philosophy have been developed with greater acumen, and that the Pantheistic view of the universe has been unfolded with far greater impressiveness, no such addition of thought and strength has been made as must needs terrorize the Christian mind into capitulation. If the Christian faith won its ascendency in a world in which the intellectual conditions were virtually the same as in our age, there is no reason why we should be crushed by the intellectual incubus which was so easily thrown off by Clement of Alexandria, by John Chrysostom and by Augustine. The second consideration is that on further examination the new intellectual situation is in itself much less sinister than might appear on a provisional survey. It is not as if the Church had to reckon with the position that intellect had weighed its first principles in the balance, and had with unfaltering voice declared the Christian system impossible. No such claim is made or can be made. Philosophy stands, not for a body of assured

affirmations and negations, but only for a set of tasks and problems, and for a special critical and constructive method; and there is no doctrine of the world, the soul and the ultimate reality—much less any negation of such doctrine—which can be set forth as the verdict unanimously passed upon existence by the higher mind of the modern world. So far as a consensus, or at least a balance of opinion, can be alleged in regard to the fundamental question of the existence of God, the appeal to intellectual authority is rather reassuring than otherwise. Not only has Theism been defended by many of the greatest modern thinkers, but some even of the greatest, like Locke and Kant, whose principles of knowledge made it difficult for them to do so, felt constrained to excogitate some way of justifying faith in God; and although modern Agnosticism finds to some extent a prepared soil, and Pantheism has for many modern minds a strangely attractive spell, it would appear that Theism carries with it an inward corroboration which will permanently secure to it a prepotent place in rational thought, and also gives to the Church the philosophic basis that is needed for its fuller faith.

2. Even more distinctive of modern times than the newer developments of Philosophy is the transformation of the outlook upon the world and human history by the labours of modern Science. Natural Science has familiarized us with a universe which is widely different from that in which the Christian mind formerly moved, and in which it somewhat easily felt itself to be at home and near to a Heavenly Father. The picture of the realms of creation which represented the earth as the centre of things with a Heaven above and a Hell beneath, has been replaced by a vision of practically illimitable space, in which the earth has a quite minor position as the satellite of a sun which may be only one among millions of similar heavenly bodies. The age of the earth has been pushed back into a dark and unfathomable abyss of time;

and the human race, though comparatively young, had already existed, we are informed, for several hundreds of thousands of years before a true civilization began to flower in the valleys of the Euphrates and the Nile. As to the manner of the making and the replenishing of the earth, the theological idea of special creation has been replaced by the doctrines of evolution. More significant even than the particular discoveries are the principles which have guided and bounded the scientific labour. The work of science as such is done on the footing that the phenomena and the events of the world are to be explained by the action of forces resident within the natural system, and operating in accordance with fixed laws. Historical science equally conducts its investigations on the assumption that what happens in the world is to be explained by the immanent powers and capacities of human nature reacting on the natural environment, and that recourse may not be legitimately had to extra-mundane or supernatural agency. The individual historian may of course believe that there has been a supernatural factor in history, and may make a reservation in favour of the tract of so-called sacred history. But he has frequently proceeded to work over this field as well in accordance with his normal methods, and has sought to correct the sacred tradition by a purely evolutionary history of Israel, or by a naturalistic "Life of Christ."

The general effect of the work accomplished in these two realms of science has been disturbing, and has been felt by some to be staggering. It can be plausibly said that, as the Christian system was closely bound up with a great deal of erroneous doctrine in the matter of Cosmology and Anthropology, the whole system of thought must be considered to have fallen under merited suspicion. It is also somewhat speciously said to be a mere case of unscientific prepossession if a historian with remorseless rationalism eliminates the miraculous elements from the

traditions of Buddhism, and reverently cherishes those which he finds in the records of the origins of Christianity. It is therefore not surprising that an impression had got abroad in popular circles that science, which as such rules out miracles, ignores the doctrine of a special revelation, and has discredited doctrines which were supposed to be vouched for by Revelation, has undermined the Christian system. It may, however, be mentioned as a warning to many who know a little science, and also to many who have deeply specialized in a particular branch of science, that Dr. Merz, the most learned historian of all that Science accomplished in all its fields during the nineteenth century, and in the periods before and after, has recently supplemented his record of scientific conquest by a book containing a personal confession of Christian faith, and also a philosophic plea for recognizing an interplay of supernatural with natural factors in the terrestrial process, and of making a venture of faith upon God and the unseen. It is true that there are realms in which Theology has confidently dogmatized where it has now been driven to learn humbly and gratefully from Science, and where it has been all too slow to learn; but on the other hand Science has found out nothing, and it may safely be predicted will find out nothing, which will compel Christian men to abandon the foundation and substance of their religious convictions. It would be fatal if it had established one or more of these propositions—that the universe, its forces and laws, account for all things therein, including their own beginnings; that the world is so constructed and arranged that God does and can do nothing in conserving and governing it, and in caring for man; and that there have not and cannot have occurred any immediate acts of the power or grace of God such as Theology calls miracles. Were one or more of these positions proved, there could not survive a Christianity such as the world has known, or, it may be added, a Christianity such as is worth

having. But these positions are not proved; and it may be somewhat confidently affirmed that natural and historical Science, instead of being entitled to ban and banish the miraculous, will feel a growing need of the category of the supernatural to help them out in an explanation of the wonders of the universe, and in a solution of the riddles of human personality and of human history.

3. The practical philosophy of modern times has also gravely increased the antithesis between the world and the Church. In the more recent period it is the Christian Ethic which, at least as much as Christian dogma, has become a stumbling-block. The concession freely made by critics in earlier controversies—that the Christian religion at least embodied a perfect code of morals—has been frequently withdrawn, and the Christian morality has been vigorously and even bitterly impugned as at once imperfect and impracticable. The Christian ideal has been attacked as erring both by defect and by excess —by defect in its exclusion of masculine and self-respecting virtues which adorned the Hellenic code, by excess in its inclusion of such servile traits as humility, patience and other passive virtues, not to speak of the more inward group of the theological graces. When we consider specially the field of social obligations, we find the difference to be that former generations did not generally practise the distinctively Christian principles, but made confession of sin for not doing so, while a later generation has not only not practised them, but has not felt it necessary to confess its guilt of omission and commission. The realms of industry and commerce have never been very deeply leavened by the professed ethical principles of Christendom, and many have lately been relieved to be assured that Christ and His disciples had no real understanding or appreciation of the economic sphere, and that the Christian law is in this field irrelevant or unauthoritative. It is doubtful if those responsible for the

policy of Christian states, and of their international relations, have ever taken very much guidance from the law of Christ; but there has been a modern innovation in that, during the last two centuries, the rulers have been encouraged by many political philosophers to think that there is no need to pay deference to a supposed revealed law of duty which stands above the dictates of the enlightened self-interest of a progressive people. In defending the Christian Ethic against the modern assault the Church has to make an admission and a confession. The admission is that the Christian code does not furnish the whole body of morality, but that it has to some extent to gather up and absorb elements from the general moral life of humanity, and in particular from the dictates of conscience as these were elaborated in the Greek code, and in other expressions of reflective ethical thought. The confession is that it has not itself believed very firmly in, or testified very powerfully on behalf of, the distinctive principles of the Christian Ethic. It has not made the impression that it entirely believed in the practicability of Christ's laws of love and self-sacrificing service; and that it earnestly set itself to induce men to regulate their lives by these in business and pleasure, and to persuade nations to adopt them as normative of their economic arrangements, and of their intercourse with other peoples. But whatever may be said of the past action of its representatives and exponents, there is no need to apologize for the Christian moral code. The Christian character can legitimately gather up into itself all the virility and self-culture of the Greek ideal, and unite them with its own graces of tenderness and piety into a matchless combination of strength and beauty which may bid defiance to detraction. As regards the social and political bearings of Christian Ethics, it may be confidently maintained that the mistake which has been made by the world was, not that it once professed its adhesion to the law of Christ, but that it did not give it

a fair chance of proving its value by seriously attempting to put it into practice. There is need not of less, but of more, of the spirit of Christ and of the ideals of Christ to bring peace and healing to our storm-ridden and strife-riven world.

4. In the domain of literature there has in recent times been a steadily widening breach with the Christian faith. During the Christian period literature has usually been willing to be baptized, it has occasionally though rarely given evidence of an evangelical conversion, and it has often shown a somewhat marked proclivity to relapse into Paganism. In the eighteenth century there was a widespread defection on the part of the greater literary figures. In England the tendency was largely held in check by Addison and Johnson, Cowper and Burke; but in France its negations and its scorn reappeared in Voltaire, and the golden age of German literature, which has its chief glory and its symbol in Goethe, was essentially Hellenic rather than Christian in its spirit and its ideals. The religious revival which separated the eighteenth century from the nineteenth left a deep impression on the heart and mind of the Western nations. In Germany and France a man of genius could again think and write as a Christian without exciting surprise, while the great men of the Victorian age, Tennyson and Browning, Thackeray and Ruskin, looked out on the world through Christian eyes, and preached in their own ways the Christian gospel. America, also, laid at the feet of Christ gifts of gold, frankincense and myrrh. Since the last quarter of the bygone century, however, the Christian profession has again tended to disappear from the higher walks of continental literature. Though a definitely Christian message underlies the most impressive products of the Russian genius, it has been otherwise in the works of most writers of international renown. Ibsen was as little of a Christian as one of the old Vikings, Maeterlinck has been placed by the Roman Catholic Church on the

index in which it seeks to pillory the religious pests of literature, Anatole France is an apostle of Agnosticism relieved by a sentimental appreciation of some phases of Christianity. Among English men of letters it has not been easy recently to find a first-rate poet with Christian convictions who can be placed beside Francis Thompson; our two greatest novelists have lost faith in the Providential government of the world; and our most brilliant dramatist, while he undoubtedly shares the sympathies of the good Samaritan, reminds us chiefly of the trenchant cleverness of Goethe's Mephistopheles—except that Mephistopheles had a more positive religious creed, and sometimes trembled when he pondered it. Our most popular English essayist, on the other hand, has fortunately placed his paradoxical mind at the service of Christianity as he understands and appreciates it. When we descend to the second and third grades of literary eminence, the average position in relation to Christianity is that represented by our chief newspapers, which cultivate a respectful but non-committal attitude, while of competent if obscure writers there is a considerable minority who more or less unmistakably betray their imagined superiority to the religious superstitions of the past. The proportion of really good contemporary literature which is written from an intelligent, instructed, and definite Christian standpoint is certainly not very large.

Whether this state of things is more the misfortune of the Church or of literature is matter for argument. It is certainly to the loss of literature. Christianity has supplied to many men of genius a subject matter to which they owed as much as to their genius; and it is certain that the great ideas of the Christian system contain treasures of divine wisdom and of human experience which would furnish many a man of talent, if he could inwardly appropriate them, and skillfully use them, with far richer and more beautiful material than he otherwise has or is likely to have at his command. On the other

hand it is certainly a calamity for the Church that the succession which included Dante and Milton has come to an end, and not less that a great mass of the mediocre literature in which our generation finds rest and refreshment seems to belong to a different world from that in which the gospel is preached and the sacraments are administered. How the situation is to be improved is not clear. Probably one need not be afraid about the attitude of the great men who are to come. Genius is a mysterious gift which probably proceeds somewhat immediately from the Father of Lights, it has an affinity with the gifts through revelation and inspiration which came to prophets and apostles, and as surely as the world may be expected to be further enriched in the future with new men of genius, as confidently may it be expected that genius will be prompted by an instinctive feeling to assert its affinity with Christian faith. If genius takes this course, talent will probably follow, according to custom, in its footsteps. Literary talent is, indeed, less prone by nature to faith than is its greater sister, and its general conversion to the service of Christ in the field of letters is an event which might perhaps be despaired of were there not some closely relevant historical precedents which show that it can become willing and able, under special conditions of spiritual atmosphere, to bring its thoughts into subjection to the faith of Christ.

II

THE OFFENCE OF THE EARNEST

It has usually been taken for granted that godly and earnest people will as a matter of course be attracted to one of the historic branches of the Church of Christ, and become devoted and active members of the recognized Christian fellowship. This has not always been the case. Montanists, Donatists, and Puritans were critics of the Church from the standpoint of a superior

sanctity. There are societies of Methodistical Christians who hold aloof from the Lutheran Church. In the English speaking world there are numerous examples of non-ecclesiastical Christians. Let us enumerate and weigh the chief criticisms which come from such quarters.

1. There is a charge of insincerity. Many are disappointed at the results which they find in the characters and lives of the members of the historic Churches. They do not find that they are readily distinguishable from those who make no religious profession, much less that they furnish clear evidence of a supernatural work of grace in their souls. Where there is so little to show in correspondence with the professed experiences and aims they feel repelled by an organization made up (as they say) of three parts of hypocrisy to one of sincerity.

In this accusation, unfortunately, there is a good deal of truth. It is painful, after reflecting upon the scope of the baptismal and communion vows, and of the aspirations voiced in our hymns, to contrast these with the actual level and accomplishment of the life of the average member of one of the great Christian communions. But there is much else to be remembered by those who are thereby tempted to shake off the dust of their feet against the institution. Thoroughgoing hypocrisy is rightly an offence to the earnest, as it is soul-destroying to the hypocrite: but the condition of the average member is not hypocrisy; his status is that the profession made in his Church membership represents what he would fain be at his best, and in part actually is; and it is certainly better that he should make profession of his high ideal, however regrettable may be his shortcomings, than that he should abandon it in despair of ever reaching it. Further, it must be acknowledged to be one of the wonders of the world that there exists an international society, touching practically every civilized community, in which men, women and children are bound together in declared allegiance to the loftiest aims that they know—we may

be thankful that such an organization exists at all; and it may well seem to be the duty of every earnest soul, instead of dreaming of some better substitute which will remain an imagination, to do what in him lies to make the historic society correspond more closely to the idea, and to insure that at least one of its members will be worthy of his high vocation.

2. A second count of the indictment may be summarized as inefficiency. There is complaint that the Church is an institution which is half-hearted in its devotion and perfunctory in its work. If anywhere we are to look for zeal and thoroughness, surely it is in the society which professes to work for a Kingdom of God in the power of divine grace; but as a fact it would appear that, in those departments in which a comparison is possible, the efforts of the Church contrast somewhat painfully with the efforts of the world. Both have a hand in education, to take an example of parallel efforts, but the contributions of the Church are sporadic and feeble in comparison with the work which is now generally done under the direction of public authority, and with the support of public resources; and even religious instruction is provided by the Church in a way which generally falls very far short of the standard which is set in secular instruction. Both Church and State take a hand in the business of relieving the poor, but while the Church's charity has the advantage of being dispensed more unobtrusively and sympathetically, its services to the poor are extremely haphazard and ineffective in comparison with what is now done by the civil authorities of the more progressive countries in dealing with every form of human distress. Is it then to be wondered at, it is asked, if a man who is deeply in earnest about doing good in his day and generation should rather feel drawn to the field of national and municipal politics, where there is a better prospect of getting machinery set in motion which will insure that important work will be effectively done? To

take another instance which lends itself to comparison: the Church resembles the Army in that it consists of an organized mass of individuals who are made subject to discipline; but it is stated that some officers, who know what discipline really means, have lost their respect for the Church as a society which seems to have neither the wish nor the courage to enforce its own laws. A further contrast is forced on our attention by the great European war. In every country there has been an impressive manifestation of patriotic fervour, the most extraordinary sacrifices have been made for the defence and well-being of a fatherland, and organization has been developed with exclusive regard to what was necessary to accomplish the object; but though the Church exists to promote even a nobler cause than patriotism, and though the evils with which it seeks to cope are even worse, as they are more persistent, than the menaces and the blows of a foreign enemy, its prevailing mood is Laodicean at the best, and its display of energy is generally in harmony with its Laodicean spirit.

To this criticism a fairly satisfactory reply can be made up to a certain point. The matters in which the Church is slack and inefficient, it may be said, are secondary to its calling. In education and the relief of the poor it is unfair to charge it with inefficiency, since it looked after these concerns when they were otherwise neglected, and now that it has persuaded society at large to take over the obligations, it may quite creditably leave the chief responsibility and burden to civil authorities. What has happened is that, in the evolution of society, the Church has been thrown back more exclusively on her primary and distinctive functions—as preaching, pastoral ministry, missionary enterprises in the home and foreign fields; and never before did she devote herself to these central objects with greater enthusiasm and effectiveness. But while there is undoubted force in this rejoinder, it does not wholly dispose of the criticism.

Even upon the central things there are marks of lukewarmness and inefficiency. It may be true, as some good judges have contended, that the average of preaching was never so workmanlike and interesting as it is today, but it is also true that many sermons continue to furnish flagrant examples of empty and futile human speech; and it is also probably true that ours is not one of the periods in which preaching very manifestly does work in altering the centre of gravity in sinful souls, and changing the bent of individual wills. It may also be thought that one result of the heavy demand made upon preachers for workmanlike and interesting sermons has issued in a comparative neglect of the all-important mission of the Church to the young. Pastoral labour which, when competently done, is one of the chief means of grace at the disposal of the Church, yields results which are undeniably disappointing. The Foreign Mission enterprise of the Church is the chiefest modern illustration of its power to evoke enthusiasm and devotion; but when these are measured in terms of the annual pecuniary contribution made by each member of the great Churches it must be confessed that boasting is excluded. On the whole the force of this count of the indictment must be largely admitted.

3. Another cause of offence to earnest minds is that the Church, in virtue of the fact that it is an institution, is disposed to follow the rule of expediency. It is a common complaint that a corporation has no conscience, and this is so far true that it tends to regard its own real or fancied interests as the touchstone of policy. The Church, it is maintained, follows the same course, and it is peculiarly liable to self-deception in the matter inasmuch as it sets before itself the exalted ends of the glory of God and the good of mankind, and it is therefore never difficult for it to persuade itself that whatever tends to strengthen so exalted and beneficent an institution is right, and that whatever weakens or discredits

it is wrong. This canon of judgment has sometimes brought the Church into violent collision with the better conscience of mankind. It supplied to the mediaeval Church the justification for the attempt to stamp out by persecution novel opinions which, whatever else could be said on their merits, were felt to be unsettling or dangerous. In the Protestant Churches, also, it has not been at all certain that, when the choice lay between doing justice to an individual or risking some injury to the Church, the claims of justice would receive the preference. To the same root also may be referred the timidity which has appeared to be specially characteristic of the modern Protestant Church. In the patristic and mediaeval periods the Church was a nursery of heroism; the heroic tradition was carried over into the older Protestantism by Reformers, Puritans and Covenanters; but more recently it seems to have decided, in weighing the cardinal virtues, that the greatest of these is prudence. No one expects of it any great show of courage in the championship of an unpopular cause, or in the denunciation of popular abuses and prejudices, or even of popular vices. In this connection complaint has been made of the unfortunate influence which has been exerted upon the action of the modern Church by the circumstance that it has become so entirely dependent on the power of money for developing and carrying on its vast schemes for the propagation of the gospel throughout the world, and for the amelioration of the conditions of civilized society. It does not appear that any considerable capital fund had to be raised to evangelize the world in the first centuries, or to carry out the Protestant Reformation, but the enterprises of the modern Church would be overtaken by crippling disaster were it not for the vast contribution which is annually received from the wealth of Europe and America. One regrettable consequence, it is pointed out, is that the Church has somewhat disproportionately multiplied its attentions to the wealthier

classes. A second is that it has shrunk from giving offence to these classes, or arousing their suspicions as to the social bearings of Christian principles.

In such strictures, though they might be more gently formulated, there is an undoubted measure of truth. The Church has inevitably shared in the institutional spirit, and that spirit has in some degree impaired its courage and weakened its hands. But it can also be conscientiously said that it is easy to exaggerate in pressing this charge. It may be asserted with much confidence that the Church, while never blind to its own interests, can be more confidently depended on than any other organization at least to listen to proposals which, though running counter to material interests, are urged in the name of duty and loyalty to Christ, and also that ecclesiastical authorities may not infrequently be found to reject the appeal to their human nature, and to follow the loftier motive. There may also, so far as the accusation is substantial, be urged certain pleas in extenuation. It may be admitted, for one thing, that the divine treasures of the Christian faith and the Christian ideals ran some risk of deterioration when they were entrusted to an ecclesiastical organization; and that as a fact the sacred deposit has not been too well administered by the ecclesiastical trustees; but on the other hand we have to consider that the alternative was not whether the world should possess a higher form of Christianity than that which has been mediated through the ecclesiastical organization, but whether mankind at large—as distinct from a few prophetic coteries—should be placed in, and continue in possession of, the blessings of Christianity at all. As regards the accusation of timidity, it has to be remembered that most questions upon which the Church might have taken a bolder and more aggressive line—and this especially holds of questions with a political and social bearing—are more or less controversial matters among good men; and a fair defence can be made

out for the view that the Church was right in confining itself in the main to the propagation of Christian principles, and to the endeavour to form Christian character, and that if it was fairly successful in these endeavours it could with a good conscience leave controverted questions of social politics and the like to the arbitrament of secular tribunals, and be satisfied to make an indirect, but none the less valuable contribution, to the solution of the difficult problems of modern society.

III

THE OFFENCE OF THE MULTITUDE

While it has been usual in periods of self-conscious enlightenment for the intellectual classes to become detached and sceptical in regard to a traditional religion, and while earnest souls have often been found in revolt from the popular religion on ethical grounds, the common people have usually been conservative in their religious sympathies and stubborn in their loyalty. Of the modern world this cannot be very confidently affirmed. There has been a great falling away of the multitude both in Roman Catholic and Protestant lands. Some of the chief causes of offence may be specified.

1. It may appear a somewhat trivial explanation of the growing popular indifference, but it is of very real consequence, that the Church and its services have ceased to be so interesting as they were in earlier conditions of society. It has been the rule in earlier periods of the Christian dispensation that persons with aesthetic and metaphysical interests could only find some satisfaction of these by resorting to the House of God; but in the developed life of our civilized communities these things are abundantly provided in other places and in other ways. Time was when a sermon, in addition to conveying a religious message, was a chief means of gratifying the popular taste for vivid history or striking incident, or

furnishing ideas on events of public and national importance; but in our time these demands are met more fully and agreeably by the newspaper and the magazine, the novel, the theatre and the picture-house. A generation which asks to be interested, prefers to be amused, and even craves for a recurrent thrill of excitement, naturally finds the sober monotony of the traditional worship to be somewhat dull and wearisome, and it is perhaps surprising in view of recent levity that there has not been even more reason to complain of diminishing Church membership and of depleted congregations. In regard to this reproach the blame must be divided between the world and the ministry. It is the fault of the world if men do not find it interesting to take part one day of the week in a service which brings before them the most vital and stirring issues of life and death, of the seen and of the unseen. It is the fault of the ministry if it is not able to invest such themes with absorbing interest.

2. When we look deeper we see reason to think that another cause is disappointment with the provisions of the Christian religion. There has been loss of confidence in it as a means of procuring and insuring these blessings on which the popular mind is naturally disposed to set the chief store. In the past—and that not only in the heathen world, but also within the Christian pale—religion has been highly valued as a means of guaranteeing success and prosperity, and of averting failure and calamity. The evangelization of the pagan nations of Europe in the early Middle Ages was largely promoted by the assurance that the gods of the heathen were less powerful allies in battle than the Christ of God, and the same set of ideas was further illustrated by votive-offerings, thank-offerings and other methods of procuring the protection of the Supreme Being, of the Virgin and of patron saints. When the result was not what had been looked for, it could be explained that punishment had been inflicted for some sin, or that the prayers had

not been directed in the right way to the most powerful mediator. Today we live in a world which, with the popularization of scientific knowledge, thrusts upon the general mind a different explanation when prayers of the sort are not answered, and which suggests a different kind of remedy. The epidemic is traced to insanitary conditions and infection, and the suggestion naturally follows that protection is to be found, not in praying more or praying otherwise, but in adopting preventive and precautionary measures against the ravages of the disease. Little occurs to make the farming classes more certain of the efficacy of their prayers for rain and sunshine, but evidence steadily accumulates as to the great practical value of science for agriculture. It is quite true that God works in and through the forces of nature, exercises a providential government, and can answer prayers even for material blessings, but this is a conception which is hidden even from many of the wise and prudent, and it is not therefore wonderful that the ordinary mind fails to grasp it, and is disposed to think that natural causes are an alternative to, and even a somewhat promising substitute for, the hypothesis of a Divine Providence. To the spiritual mind again it has always been evident that the blessings of the Christian religion are essentially spiritual blessings, and that the only promise in regard to the other kind is that we shall receive the things which can be made to work together for our good; but the general mind is not so finely constituted, and it may be expected that, unless there should be a great popular increase of spiritual experience and insight, there may follow a much greater popular declension from the religion which is able so deeply to disappoint the hopes of the natural man.

In another way the Church has proved disappointing to the multitude which looks to religion as the source of practical benefits. Reference has already been made to the fact that in earlier times the Church, in addition to

fulfilling its more religious function, carried on a many-sided mission which had very great cultural and philanthropic results; and as the Church in the evolution of society has to a large extent denuded itself, or been denuded, of these supplementary activities, there has been a corresponding decline in the general estimate formed of the serviceableness of the institution to the general life of civil communities. To the complaints that the Church has now little to give of palpable social value, a special addition has been made in recent times. The mind of the masses has naturally tended in a democratic age to transfer its interest from religion to politics; and in pursuing its political aims it has been irritated to find that the Church at the worst is hostile, at the best is lukewarm or apathetic, towards the popular aspirations, and that in any case it has not actively bestirred itself to further its plans. On the European Continent this feeling has been so strong that the general attitude of Social Democracy has developed into open and declared enmity to the Christian Church. In the English-speaking world the antithesis is much less acute, but there is at least a wide-spread alienation of the working-classes from the Church for which it is given as a reason that the Church cares nothing and does nothing for their material interests. In regard to those strictures three observations may be made. As to the past, the democratic school which regards the Church with contempt and hostility is unjust in forgetting the splendid contribution which the Church has made, not only in mitigating social distress, but in forming the conscience which resents the evils of the existing state of things, and is groping towards a juster and fairer social order. As regards the recent past and the present, the Church, as already said, cannot be strongly blamed for labouring to preserve to itself the character of a sanctuary in which men who differed widely in mundane controversies could worship together in peace and brotherhood. Whether

in the future it will be possible for the Church to maintain this attitude is problematical. What is certain is that the Church and especially the Protestant Church has been too much bound up with a class view of human society and of social problems, and that unless it can deepen and broaden its democratic sympathies it will more and more lose its influence over the general life of the nations.

3. A third and cognate reason for a decline of the Church's influence on the multitude may be that the modern clergy are deficient in certain characters which are needed to win the confidence and to elicit the devotion of the masses. It is true that the latter-day clergy, and not least Protestant Ministers, are a pre-eminently respectable body of men, who are almost wholly free from scandal, and who also represent a high level of intelligence and knowledge. The stock charges which were formerly levelled at the clergy as a class are now felt to be slanderous when they are not ridiculous. But it is also true that the popular mind is disposed to make upon ministers of religion a further demand for evident self-denial in regard to the palpable goods of this world, and that the modern ministry does not very obviously and impressively comply with this expectation. The Christ who conquered the heart of the world was the Christ who had not where to lay His head, and who sealed His mission by the blood which was shed on Calvary; and the model which has been accepted for the great body of His ministers, especially in the Protestant Churches, is that of a comfortable middle-class existence in which the spiritual work is done in a setting of domestic happiness, social enjoyment and literary leisure. There are of course many advantages in this ideal, and it has been found to be not incompatible with a detachment in spirit from the world, and with a zeal for the salvation of souls, which in individual cases have evoked extraordinary manifestations of reverence and gratitude. But it is in-

contestable that if the Church is to make a new and deeper impression on the world, it must be prepared to invest the ministry with more unambiguous evidences of a world-despising and self-forgetting devotion. It may not be desirable as a general policy to throw over the traditional Protestant conception of the minister as a normal member of a middle stratum of society, and to refuse him the benefits of the Pauline principle—"All things are yours;" but room should certainly be made for other types of ministry, which, by exhibiting to the world the joyful abnegation of the goods to which it attaches supreme value, would win greater love and trust for the Church as the home of Christlike sacrifice.

4. The influence of the Church with the masses has also been seriously impaired through the weakening of the authoritative note. To some extent this is due to a loss of self-confidence on the part of those who deliver the message of the Church. The distinctively Catholic and Anglican message may be sounded by many as unfalteringly as ever, and the same is true of the voices in certain evangelical circles, but in the Protestant Churches generally it is observable that the average preacher does not so boldly take the ground of the men of former generations who demanded to be listened to as heralds of the very word of God, and ambassadors for Christ. In the measure in which the preacher neglects to claim and use the authority of a speaker for God, and merely utters his message, from the standpoint of a private observer, thinker and sympathizer, it is certain that he disappoints the popular mind which earnestly asks to be instructed in reliance on the highest authority, and is prepared to be convinced, by those who are sure of their commission, that it is its duty to believe and to obey. So far as this source of weakness exists the remedy must probably be left to the God whose Spirit gives the boon of assurance in witnessing with the spirits of His servants. More obvious, perhaps, is the decay of ecclesiastical

authority as the result of the divisions of Christendom, and in particular of the subdivisions of Protestantism. The world, which expects to be authoritatively taught, has inevitably found itself puzzled and repelled by the spectacle of a Christendom torn by internecine strife; and it certainly has not disposed the Protestant nations to respect the Church, and to feel confidence in its message, when they were aware of a Babel of voices as to the nature of the Gospel, and witnessed a competition for patronage which in some ways resembled the devices of the market-place. It would therefore seem that the better consolidation of the Christian Church is a necessary condition of the recovery of that measure of ecclesiastical authority which has a legitimate place in human society, and it may be predicted that in the next generation self-interest will combine with duty—though some new dangers may threaten—to carry the Church far on the path of re-union.

IV

THE OUTLOOK

The moral drawn by some observers from the changes in the position of the Church, and also from the evidence of weakness and difficulties which have been mentioned, has been that it is a decadent institution which is doomed to dissolve and disappear. Secular spirits have rejoiced in the prospect as promising to relieve the world of an incubus of ignorance and superstition, as well as of imaginary obligations; while some otherwise sympathetic philosophers have also acquiesced in the prospect on the supposition that what was true in the message and valuable in the services of the Church would be absorbed and conserved in the life and functions of the larger organism of the State. In opposition to this view it can be held on very strong grounds that we are entitled to believe in the perpetuity of the Church. Its perpetuity, however, may quite well consist with somewhat

drastic changes in the forms of its life and activity. There are also grave problems awaiting it in the future, the solution of which is veiled in deep obscurity. Some reflections may be added on each of these topics.

1. That the Church will have a permanent place as a distinctive institution in human societies may be confidently expected on the twofold ground of the needs of mankind and of the faithfulness of God.

It does not seem to be disputable that the higher life of the race would be very gravely and sadly impoverished by the disappearance of the Church and its ministries. Its worship is the most sublime, significant and reverent of all the collective acts in which human beings unite to give expression to common thoughts, moods and purposes. Even when allowance is made for its failures, it has been more successful than any other educative and moulding power in the difficult and all-important work of forming noble character. In every community of the civilized world, and in many communities beyond the boundaries of civilization, it has planted societies which are rallying points of those who have the vision of a higher life, and who encourage and help both themselves and others to live in obedience to the heavenly vision. In some respects the need of its ethical and social services has become even more urgent in the light of special modern conditions: the problem of the training of the child is a perennial reminder of the moral value of the influences mediated by the Church, while the confused condition of modern society, in which so many families and individuals have been torn away from steadying influences, and scattered abroad as sheep without a shepherd, has made it clear that nothing would be so useful as a really effective pastoral ministry of the Church which should come into close relations with every home and every life. It may also well be thought, in view of the catastrophe of the great European war, and of the problems and the passions which it will leave behind as

a legacy, that the world will have greater need than ever of an institution which will effectively represent the higher conscience of humanity, and try to develop in earnest an international Christian fellowship. In view even of these ethical and social utilities of the Church, it seems probable that, if the Christian Church had not descended from antiquity, the modern world would have felt constrained to do its best to organize a similar institution. The case from human need becomes much stronger when we reflect upon the specially religious wants to which the Church makes its powerful response in speaking consolation, not otherwise procurable, to those who are burdened by the sense of sin, and of irremediable suffering, and by haunting fears of "what the great Beyond shall bring."

On the other hand we have, corresponding to the great need, a great hope based on the promise and the faithfulness of God. The hope is that God will protect it and uphold it, and that though it may have its seasons of decrepitude and decay, He can be depended on to revive and refresh it by His Spirit, to lift up the hands that hang down, and to strengthen the feeble knees. The promise was given in word when Jesus said that "the gates of Hell shall not prevail against it," and it has been repeatedly renewed and confirmed in the acts of history. As has been well said, though the Church has often seemed to be dying if not already dead, there has been in it and behind it the same power which raised up Jesus Christ from the dead.

This power of the Spirit has been put forth at many times—most notably when the Church was sinking under the load of mediaeval corruptions and superstitions, and again when the virtue seemed to have died out of it in the eighteenth century; and in the light of these experiences we may somewhat confidently hope that the uncertainty and the confusion, the weakness and the distress, will again make their successful appeal to

the life-giving Spirit, and that the twentieth century, and other centuries thereafter, will join with a new fervour in the old song:

"God in the midst of her doth dwell,
Nothing shall her remove,
The Lord to her an helper will,
And that right early prove."

2. While there are good grounds for believing in the permanence of the Christian Church, it is quite probable that there will be important modifications of the ways and forms in which it has hitherto administered its trust, and met the religious and moral needs of mankind. The question of Creed will have to be reconsidered. Even if there should be an unprecedented spiritual revival throughout the Protestant area, the question will not be disposed of by a sympathetic rehabilitation of schemes of orthodox doctrine. The Protestant Churches will be forced by candour and the pressure of facts to adopt a somewhat bold policy of toleration and comprehensiveness in relation to all living Christian types, and to frame corresponding tests and terms of communion. The Greek and Roman Catholic theory will doubtless continue to be as before that not only all priests but also all members must hold, implicitly if not explicitly, the whole body of doctrine which has been stamped as orthodox; but it has long been impossible for the Protestant Church to maintain this position in practice; and it should be attempted to bring the theory into harmony with the actual practice by making it clear that the Church tolerates within really liberal limits different schools of positive theology, and can heartily appreciate wide varieties of genuine religious experience. Passing to the work of the Church we may expect some change in the scale and the proportion of the different departments of its labour. It was remarked that during recent times the Church has more and more tended to specialize in

the purely spiritual field, but it is quite probable that in the next stage there will be a strong reaction in favour of combining a gospel for society with the gospel for the individual, and that, though it may not reclaim secular fields for its own activities, it will at least demand to be heard on behalf of Christ on all issues which deeply affect national and social well-being. As regards its peculiar field of spiritual ministration, it may be doubted if the same demands will be made for preaching, which were made in earlier periods, on the main body of the Protestant ministers. It is extremely likely that in the next generation the truly gifted preachers will have an almost unprecedented opportunity and welcome, but it may also be expected that there will be a waning desire to receive religious instruction from those of us who have the mark of intellectual and spiritual commonplaceness, and that the habit of regular church-going may even further decline. In some points of view this will be deeply regrettable, but it will not be an unmixed misfortune if it leads to the reconsideration of the respective urgency of the claims which are made upon the time and the energies of the main body of the ministry. One may attach the utmost importance, as any true Presbyterian must, to the preaching of the Word as a means of grace, and yet feel that the pulpit has sometimes been too lavishly served at the expense of equally vital interests. It will be on the whole to the good if the Protestant minister of the future, realizing that there is a lessened appreciation of pulpit oratory of the average type, sees in this a Providential leading to devote a much larger measure of zeal and strength to the Christian education of the young, to the organization and leadership of the members of his congregation in good works, and above all to the invaluable pastoral ministry which comes into intimate spiritual relations with every family apart and with every individual apart.

3. If a great spiritual revival of the Church is soon to

come, as the needs of the time seem to promise, in the providence and the grace of God, it will make short work of many of the difficulties and obstacles of which we have spoken. It will bring into the Church a fuller and deeper life, with its customary enthusiasms for truth, for holiness and for the salvation of souls, and the spirit brooding over the movement will guide the renascent energies into the appropriate channels. But even in that case there will be urgent problems of which the solution is not apparent. One is the problem of Christian unity. While present tendencies are making strongly towards the reunion at least of the cognate branches of the Christian Church, it might happen that a fresh spiritual upheaval would bring into existence a distinctive type of doctrine and experience which would run counter to the more liberal tendency which has been spoken of, and even demand a separate ecclesiastical form. In any case we may expect wisdom and charity to be heavily taxed for a time in order to find a method of joining together those sections of the Church that have no solid reason for being sundered, and also of bringing together in some scheme of friendly federation those greater branches which think compromise impossible. A second difficult problem is how the Church is to be related in the future to the world. At this point there emerges, not only the question of the relation of Church and State—which in some lands will be sufficiently acute—but the even more important question of the relation in which the Christian society is to stand to the main body of the populations of the civilized world. Is it to confine its membership to those who are credibly converted and in process of being sanctified, or is it to continue to comprehend in some way the great proportion of the sincere and respectable but decidedly unspiritual mass of humanity? The third capital problem is how the Church is to bear itself in the impending strife of classes which, perhaps even more than race and nation-

ality, promises to give its special character to the next stage of the history of the civilized world. Race and nationality have sometimes proved strong enough to break up the Church, and to impress their own character upon its separate divisions; and it remains to be seen whether, as the conflict develops between Individualism and Socialism, the Church will be driven to take sides—with new experiences of disruption—or will be able, with a good conscience and with good success, to serve as an angel of conciliation to the parties in the stress. For the solution of this problem it will need in ample measure the apostolic conjunction of power and of love and of a sound mind.

The Two Levels of Religion

By J. K. Mozley, B.D.

The object of this paper is, first of all, to draw a contrast. The contrast is not an absolute one, as between good and evil, but a relative one as between less and more. Nevertheless, it is a real and important one. It is the contrast between that level of faith, moral orientation and actual practice, which is, not wholly but chiefly, the result of the projection of opinions, desires and volitions which a man finds easily in his own heart, and that level which implies such a new creation that the whole man is raised above what may have been his own former status, and is certainly the status of natural humanity. The faith and spiritual experience which are his, and the moral possibilities of which he is conscious as real possibilities for him, pass right beyond anything given by a *Lex Naturae* in the sphere either of belief or of practice.

I then propose to argue that, effective Christianity being of the higher level (proof of which will be seen in the presentation of the contrast, without the necessity for formal argument), much of our present-day religious weakness, that common subject of complaint, is due to a failure to emphasize the higher level. As a result, large numbers of persons, even among those who attend our churches and would in all sincerity claim for themselves the *nomen Christianum,* rest content with that lower level which I call the natural level in distinction from that higher, distinctively Christian, level, in which, as regards both faith and practice, is imbedded the idea of supernaturalism. Let me say at once that the natural level

is not in itself bad; earthly it is, for it is hemmed in by restrictions which originate in the given conditions of earthly life, but essentially it is neither sensual nor devilish, though it may become such. Its inadequacy, its incompleteness, is its true characteristic; its relationship to the higher level is not unlike that of Judaism to Christianity. All that is good in it is taken up on to the higher level. Never must we forget (and St. Paul gives us the lead in Romans 2:14,15) that both nature and grace are of God; only, we must also not forget that there are involved two creating acts of God. The first act constitutes the level of nature; the second, which we speak of as revelation, but which is not illumination alone but the act of redemption, the level of grace. This in itself is a new creation, and has the power to make man a new creation, a καινὴ κτίσις. The new creation as effected and experienced in man answers to God's revelation of a world of intellectual, moral and spiritual reality, which is partially, though not completely (cf. Rom. 1:19,20), discernible through the world of nature, that is, the world of natural phenomena interpreted through man's natural powers, these powers themselves being part-evidence of the higher reality.

I

Let us look more closely at the natural level of religion and ethic, and take note of its characteristics. In the forefront I should place reliance upon instinct, which, in a perverted form, appears as the following of inclination. This instinct constantly assumes those conclusions which Kant arrived at by the method of the practical reason—belief in a God, in a personal immortality and in the moral responsibility which involves free will. But the positive content of the two first-mentioned beliefs is meagre. What is to be said about God and about immortality remains very uncertain. In practice, the two beliefs can be combined and presented in some such form as "God

is the good and all-powerful Being Who will some day put all things right and redress the injustices of earthly life." The third belief has a clearer form, a moral idea being, on this level, always more perspicuous than a religious one. There is a real sense of moral obligation. The unsophisticated conscience condemns certain acts as undoubtedly evil and imposes upon itself a law of abstention. Nor is the affirmative side lacking; justice, purity, truthfulness, kindness, unselfishness, are regarded as ideals which ought to be followed, though one must recognize that the existence of hindrances and limitations which restrict both the realization, and the whole-hearted pursuit of such ideals is readily admitted—limitations which spring from what is regarded as man's existing potentiality, and from that natural common-sense which assumes the fact of moral impossibilities.

But instinct is a halting guide, and to much of the deeper truth of religion, and, in a less degree, of ethic, it remains indifferent, for that deeper truth surpasses its own natural powers of apprehension. It may conceive of God as supreme, as good, as the Father of men; but that He is Holy Love, and that the adjective is to be emphasized —this is beyond its reach: opinions thrown out on the ideas of atonement show how easy it is to minimize the reality and the extent of this reaction against moral evil. That man needs the divine forgiveness is not denied, but that forgiveness is a great thing, that it may be a tax upon God Himself, is not understood. Whereas Ritschl in his *Instruction in the Christian Religion* declares that "forgiveness of sins cannot be inferred as necessary from any universally established conception of God," this inference is almost assumed as resulting from any belief in God, and whereas he goes on to remind us that "lenity toward the imperfections of human conduct is an entirely different thing from Christian forgiveness of sins," forgiveness is treated as just such lenity, not to say indulgence. But this is really fatal to the whole idea of grace—for grace

begins as forgiveness—whether in its Catholic or its Protestant interpretation. Moreover, a religion of instinct tends to intellectual weakness, to a dislike of the dogmatic idea as well as of dogmatic forms. It is impatient of the intellectual exigencies of historic Christianity, and has no reply to give to so great a question as "What think ye of Christ?" Orthodoxy means nothing to it because it does not face the problems to which orthodoxy claims to be the answer. On the moral side it lacks vision and acuteness; the sense of obligation which it feels does not sharpen to a point the antithesis between good and evil; not for it are the heroic experiments which issue in saintliness, asceticism, Puritanism or the grandest public righteousness, for in each of these one must allow, even though one must make reservations at this point or that, the presence of a vision which pierces the conventional and comes out into a vista of unexplored but not hallucinatory moral possibilities.

Secondly, the tendency of the natural level is conformation to the present world-order. Its improvement is looked for, but hardly its re-creation or its transformation into an order immeasurably nobler and controlled at every point by Christian principles. In close connexion with this goes an inadequate and indeed poverty-stricken idea of the Church. That the relations between Church and State must be reconsidered in the light of the Gospel, that neither Church domination, nor Erastianism, nor sheer independence of one another, is the true solution, is the common theme of two suggestive books, recently published,—Dr. Forsyth's *Theology in Church and State*, and Mr. Temple's *Church and Nation*. It is certain that we shall never reach a satisfactory synthesis, so long as the Church is thought of, in the words of "an eminent politician," quoted by Mr. Temple, as "a voluntary organism for the maintenance of public worship in the interest of those who desire to join in it," or the State as a merely secular corporation. Neither Church

nor State can retain its proper dignity if so regarded. Religion becomes a purely individualistic affair, and a public manifestation of God's righteousness in the world by Church or State impossible. But the Christian hope points to a greater and not a less manifestation of that righteousness. The preparation for the time when the kingdoms of this world shall have become the kingdoms of our Lord and of His Christ ought not to be a time of contentment with an irreligious and un-Christian world order. There is a baptism into Christ for the nation as well as for the individual. Yet how hard it is to obtain any response to this positive thought of the State's permeation with the Christian leaven, even from those who have no doubt that God stands above the State, and are ready to welcome Christian ethical teaching in relation to the individual. It is only fair to recognize that the war has made a difference here, and has aroused on all sides such questions as "Why has not the Church done more to make its ethical ideal effective in the world?" But, while allowing that the witness of the Church has often been insufficient, the fact remains that suspicion of the Church, and of the intrusion of the religious into the secular, which is exceedingly common on the lower level, has added greatly to the difficulty of that witness.

Then, thirdly, all religion involves an outlook upon life, and in that outlook will mingle elements of hope and depression, according as the mind is concentrated on the final victory of God, or on the strength of all that is hostile to God and opposed to the working out of His purposes. There is danger both in exaggerated optimism and in exaggerated pessimism. On the natural level that danger is great. For the religion of that level can easily adopt as the expression of its outlook the line "God's in His heaven, all's right with the world." But the latter part of the verse is true only prophetically, not in present actuality, and an optimism which is not prophetically and teleologically confident, which has no room for a great

theodicy, that is, for a justification of God despite and even through the evils of life, is liable to be overborne by the presence of apparent facts. Orthodox Christianity, which already possesses a theodicy in the Cross, is neither surprised nor speechless in the presence of evil aggressively triumphant. But the resources of natural optimism are slight, and faith, that "victory that overcometh the world," grows dim when sharply challenged by that which presents itself to sight. A writer in the *Saturday Review* for July 1, 1916, can say (I give the substance, not the exact words) that thousands of sane minds in Europe are sure that the world is not governed by supreme wisdom. Is natural optimism strong enough to withstand such sanity in this hurricane of war? If the war has not as yet done more harm to religion—and we shall not be able to say till after the end what harm it has done—this is due not to natural resources but to the sought and experienced grace of God. Conversely, the pessimism of this natural level checks true moral effort, since the idea of a God for whom all things are possible is not really reached, and the evils of the world-order come not as a surprise but as the inevitable attendants upon human existence. If the objection is urged that the assumption that God is Almighty is common in a religion of instinct, it may fairly be answered that on this point we see those who usually show themselves hostile to what they call "dogma" holding to a dogma which they either do not trouble, or feel themselves unable, to relate to the facts of life.

II

Now we may pass to the higher level which, as transcending anything given in nature as a whole, or in man's natural endowments, I speak of as supernatural, and study its characteristic notes. Prominent, at the very outset, is an attitude towards religious truth and moral action different from that which hitherto we have been

considering. Not by looking hard at nature or at the present world-order do we attain to religious truth or gain the right moral orientation. These things result from, and are apprehended by us as due to, an action of God as real as His original creative act. Through this action a new relationship between God and the world has been set up, and the individual shares in the effects of this, according as he realizes it as fact through his reaction to it in faith.

Secondly, since the profoundest and most vital religious and ethical truths are not to be extracted from the original constitution of nature and humanity, the incompleteness of the natural order and the inadequacy of man's faculties are emphasized. There is no necessity for anything like Manicheeism to obtrude itself at this point; there is good in the natural order, there is good in man, but if that good is regarded as final good, if the closeness and thoroughness of the intermixture of evil with it are overlooked, if it is assumed that because God acted once and behold! all things were very good, there could be no need of another action equal in potency to that act, then the good has become the enemy of the best, and we are back again in the eighteenth century with its praise of natural religion, its doctrine of Christianity as old as creation, and its lack of grip of the thought of redemption except in so far as it could be presented as illumination. Illumination is a great thing; the moment that a really Christian epistemology comes to the front, as it does on the higher level, the need for illumination is clearly seen, since it becomes obvious that neither is the natural man the true subject of knowledge nor the natural order the true object thereof. Nevertheless, there is a deeper need than this, affecting the moral rather than the intellectual side of man. Illumination would be the pathway to the highest reality if the knowledge of the truth were simply a matter of intellectual verification, and were neither conditioned by the moral character of the

subject, nor implied any other correspondence between the subject and the truth which he professed to know than that contained in the act of knowledge itself. Neither natural probability nor experience justifies such conclusions, and in consequence we must add to the idea of illumination something which radically affects the whole man. This something is found in the idea of redemption. This idea, even in Christianity, takes different forms, but it always implies that man is raised above his merely natural condition, so that a new set of relationships are set up, whose religious and moral content is fuller and deeper than any flow of religious and moral truth and experience which might be possible on the lower level. On that level the idea of redemption counts for little, since man's native constitution is thought of as enabling him to lay hold of whatever in religion is of importance for him to know (such knowledge becomes clearer, as time goes on) and promotes his soul's good. But on the higher level this idea becomes a primary religious idea, since human nature and the whole natural order are differently and more severely judged, and the declension of the natural towards the anti-natural through sin is seen to necessitate a rehabilitation and enhancement of the natural through grace.

So, thirdly, the sense of personal insufficiency and of dissatisfaction with what a man achieves in virtue of his nature grows strong. The lower level is essentially Pelagian, the higher essentially Augustinian. The classic statement of the inward struggle in Romans 7 though not necessarily unintelligible on the lower level is most fully appreciated on the higher, and it is interesting to note that Augustine interpreted that passage of the regenerate, not of the unregenerate, man. The comparative lack of personal dissatisfaction on the lower level is quite natural, since the individual, judging himself by others who are in the same status as himself, and by the *Lex Naturae,* measures himself by no standard which compels

himself to pass a stern judgment on his own deficiencies. But, on the higher level, a new standard is set by the greatness of God's self-revelation in Christ, and by the implications of His redemptive action. Man feels that he is quite unable of himself to come into touch with that higher reality, knows that at every turn he must depend upon the grace of God. And so he prays *Da quod jubes et jube quod vis*, for he realizes that it is of God alone that he is able to fulfil God's commands.

And now, fourthly, religious experience begins to become a reality. That experience has its different sides. There is forgiveness which redresses the balance against himself, of which the individual is conscious, since he knows how insufficient is his correspondence with religious and moral reality, and how impossible it is for him to acquit himself of blame in this respect. There is the new strength springing out of forgiveness, and looking to the future as that does to the past. There is the sense of the reality and power of religious unity, of that fellowship of men redeemed into the worship and service of God which is analogous to but should transcend unity in political or social aims. On the lower level this sense of religious unity is non-existent. When in the common parlance of the day we hear of the impotence of the Churches we must remember that that is the inevitable result of the lower-level religion which is too common in the Church itself. Finally—and here religious individualism comes by its right—there is the experience of personal communion with God which binds together and gives meaning to every other kind of true religious experience.

Then, lastly, a new moral hopefulness comes to birth, something both more serious and stronger than the optimism which we observed as common on the lower level. That optimism was grounded in confidence in man's natural endowments, and, it may be added, in a wholehearted belief in education, rather than in the deliberate rejection of the whole idea of moral impossibilities

(moral miracles, especially in reference to society as a whole, are not in much greater favour on the lower level than physical ones). But on the higher level, where the guiding thought is not what man is by nature but what he becomes through grace, a deep hopefulness is in place. There is no assumption that in the course of time a perfect man and a perfect world-order will be evolved; the struggle between good and evil has no such necessary conclusion. But just as the prophets of Israel could pin their hopes to the faithful remnant, and St. Paul could see in the calling of the Gentiles the counterweight to Israel's unbelief, and the earnest of Israel's own salvation, so the Christian leaven is perceived as the instrument of God's purposes in the world. If the leaven works slowly, and there are countless set-backs to its permeation of the lump, that only calls attention to the lump's great intractability (a matter of no surprise except on the optimistic appraisement of human nature) and to the need for the leaven itself to retain its purity and to be distinguishable from the lump.

III

The foregoing exposition is itself proof that Christianity in its essence and its original form and power is a religion of the higher level, and intensely so. Its conception of God is bound up with revelation and redemption. If its moral practice often fails to be experimentally heroic, its own charter condemns it. The present world-order is not and never has been its standard. Its optimism springs from its hold on supernatural grace. It hopes all things, not least the conversion of the naturally good to a deeper insight. It correlates the thoughts of the divine action and of man's experience and grateful response.

But undoubtedly there is a present danger—of contentment with the lower level. And on that level the doctrine of Christ, of His atonement and resurrection are nigh to vanishing away. But without these we may

indeed ask "What is Christianity?" Mr. Shaw tells us in the preface to his last volume of plays: it is concerned with property, the administration of justice, and the family. The reviewer of his book in the English *Nation* for June 3, 1916, says that this is the natural Christianity of ordinary people, far more than anything which they are taught in the churches to which they do not go. But we know, and Mr. Shaw knows, that this is not the Christianity,—Mr. Shaw would say not the final Christianity,—of Christ. He allows that that Christianity included Christ's belief in His divinity, in the value of His death, and in His resurrection after death. Mr. Shaw avoids the dilemma which he is approaching by the assumption that Christ's mind became unhinged after Peter's confession, a singularly unconvincing solution, as if anyone believes anything of this kind he can find reason for holding it to be true before, as well as after, Peter's confession.

Nevertheless, there is truth in the reviewer's statement. There are Christians, who do not necessarily stay away from church, who are not at all at home with the ideas which predominate on the higher level, ideas in organic connexion with the faith in Christ's divinity, atonement and resurrection. They are to be found both in the Free Churches and in the Church of England. (The problem in Roman Catholicism is rather a different one, and it would be instructive to have it handled by a Roman Catholic writer.) A heavy count against certain sections of thought in the Free Churches has of recent years been made by Dr. Forsyth. Such he accuses of amateurishness and impatience in their religious methods, of an undue stress laid upon man's natural relationship to God, of a neglect of the doctrine of grace, of an unethicized idea of love, of a lack of the true sense for the Church in their zeal for social reform, of a reduction of Christ from Saviour to Hero and Example, and an emphasizing of the faith *of* Jesus instead of faith *in* Jesus. It is not

for a member of another communion to acclaim such charges as true. There is another side to the matter, an explanation and vindication of whatever change there has been, as expressed by such a man as Dr. J. Warschauer. But one cannot be surprised at the uneasy questionings which are voiced in Free Church circles, when one is awake to the real causes of uneasiness in the Church of England. For in it there is a conflict of the higher and lower levels. The religion of the lower level is seen in a respectability which treats religion as good form, as socially desirable, as the correct thing, though for different reasons, for all classes of the population. There is a suspicion of ethical experimentation, a conformation to the natural order, a pedestrian common-sense which is by no means the same as the heavenly wisdom. The great Christian doctrines are not so much rejected as ignored. I would not for a moment deny that true religion lives and even works in those in whom these characteristics seem to hold a large place. I refuse that "all or nothing" alternative, which takes no account of the extraordinary intricacies of personality, of the hidden chambers in which treasures never displayed before the world (would that they were!) remain undissipated. But if one asks, "are the typical experiences of the higher level, experiences of forgiveness, of grace, of communion with God, of fellowship in the Church, present and working with effective power on the whole scale of our Church of England life?" one could hardly expect a confident affirmative answer. Attacks upon the barrenness of a moderate Churchmanship have been common in some quarters of late. Those attacks are not altogether well-directed. Moderation does not necessarily connote Laodiceanism, and aversion from extremes, even from religious aggressiveness, can be the mark of another, though very different, virtue, a cautious clearsightedness which distrusts enthusiasm as a universal panacea. Yet, the attacks to which I allude are valuable, even necessary. The religion

of the higher level, whether its form be Catholic or Evangelical, is the salt of the Church, and it does not hold its proper place when moderation is looked on as a chief religious virtue.

Objection may very fairly be taken to the antithesis "Catholic or Evangelical." It is not intended as an absolute antithesis, nor is there any true reason why we should recognize such an antithesis at all. But different aspects of Christianity, and different personal reactions to it, are generally understood by these words, so that the use of them may be allowed. What is certain is that those who are in earnest with their Evangelicalism or their Catholicism are emphasizing a religion of the higher level, and laying stress on God's second act of revelation and redemption rather than on that first act of creation which established the natural order, and man with his natural endowments and potentialities. Their common position is that of St. Paul in I Cor. 2:14, 15, where he contrasts the ψυχικός with the πνευματικὸς 'ανθρωπος and finds in the latter powers of discernment and judgment absent from the former. And it would help towards a greater spirit of unity in the Church of England if Evangelicals, to whom the thought of the grace of God is central, historically and experimentally precious, realized more fully that the same thought of grace controls the outlook of those to whom, on various points, they find themselves opposed. As it is, Evangelicals are often in unnatural alliance with the ψυχικός 'ανθρωπος, whose dislike of certain beliefs, rites and practices is by no means the product of a strong religious sense, but of unfamiliarity with the whole idea of grace, and of impatience with dogma. The emphasis laid upon the sacrificial aspect of the Eucharist, upon the benefits of confession and absolution, upon the unity between the Church militant and the Church triumphant, upon the institutional side of religion, bears witness to, and is constituted in, the belief that through the grace of God a new order has been

created, and that, in the practices proper to that new order, grace is operative for the healing and strengthening of mankind. If experience did not answer to belief, the belief might then be rejected as unprofitable and untrue, but the fact of the experience is undeniable. The lives of the countless holy men and women to whom these beliefs have been their greatly-prized possessions, who have practised themselves in the ways of religion appropriate to the beliefs, are the proof. Nothing lower than the grace of God in Christ has been their strength and stay; that that grace should become ever more real and powerful in them, that in it they should grow, has been their earnest desire. And no disagreements should prevent others, who know what grace means, from acknowledging that here is testimony to the higher level, to a faith and life far transcending the natural order and the religion, good in its degree, which that order suggests. The religion of the higher level is not found in connexion only with the Evangelical or the Catholic type of piety; it is as real for many who shrink from what they look on as partisan extremes, alike remote from the true genius of the Church of England, or who are themselves representatives of a definite *tertium quid* in Liberal or Broad Churchmanship. Nevertheless, the whole future of the Church of England is dependent on whether the two "extremes" can learn to understand one another better, to recognize the true religion of the grace of God which is the source of the strength of both, and, passing beyond mere tolerance and even the higher sentiment of good will, to work together for the good of the whole Church. To hold that all this is certain to come appears to me an opinion over-optimistic in the face of the difficulties which block the way. It is safer not to raise immediate hopes too high. Old controversies are not dead, nor is their bitterness a thing of the past. What is needed, among other things, is a reconsideration of the importance of our differences. If men are agreed that Christianity stands or falls by the

principle of the grace of God in Christ, what is the exact relevance of their disagreements as to the functioning, and the application of that grace? To say that there is no relevance, or that that relevance no longer continues, is to treat history, and its meaning for the present, with a lack of due seriousness. But to exaggerate the relevance of points of controversy is particularly easy, and to make assumption fill the place of investigation.

My readers may remember how in the Introduction to *The Gospel of the Resurrection* Dr. Westcott points out that the Resurrection "is not primarily an explanation of existing phenomena, growing out of them or introduced to explain them, but a *new fact* added to the sum of human experience." From that basis its value for history, for man, and for the Church is worked out. This new fact, for all its bearing on the natural order, is essentially supernatural, the revelation of a higher order, and a call to man to adjust himself to that order. So it was understood from the first, so it remains to this day. And behind the Resurrection, behind the whole life and work of Christ and the operations of the Holy Spirit, behind them, but not out of sight, but visible in them, is the grace of God. To that grace all true Christianity, its worship and its faith and labour, is man's grateful response.

A Dissenter's Apologia

The Prospects and Message of Nonconformity

By Bernard L. Manning,
Jesus College, Cambridge.

Is Nonconformity defunct? Is it decaying? For most people it seems at least to have lost its old appeal, its old romance, its old power. Even in denominational circles the traditional war-cries have ceased to be words to conjure with. Today no one's blood tingles at the good historic word "Dissenters," and the fashionable modern name "Free Churchmen"—the genteel synonym for "Dissenters"—is scarcely likely to fire the present generation. Enthusiasm for any of our denominations today is not only a rare, but a suspect virtue. We feel that it has the awful taint of the narrow-minded, that it is allied to bigotry; and are we not incessantly assured by the newspapers that sectarianism is the most criminal of crimes—especially in war time? This feeling of ours is not confined to any one section of the nation. It is increasingly difficult to rouse public opinion on any question connected with Dissent. Even our politicians have realized this; an acute observer of political development assures us that what is called the "Dissenting interest" in politics is worth far less to the statesman than it was fifty years ago. In the nineteenth century Nonconformity was able to squeeze concessions from Mr. Gladstone, most "Churchy" of Churchmen, but modern Nonconformity even after the Armageddon of the 1906 Election was unable to secure terms on the Education or on the Temperance Question from politicians who had been

trained in our own folds. We still hear of "Passive Resistance" it is true, but Passive Resistance is a fit subject for a museum of historical curios; it is a mere relic of the political influence of Dissent. Our rights and our wrongs, even before the War, had ceased to interest the nation. They are dismissed as the petty squabbles of decaying sects. The "Nonconformist Conscience" is apparently of no more consequence than the antecedents of a candidate for the Peerage, and the suggestions for giving the President of the Free Church Council a place in the House of Lords proclaim a desire to recognise in Nonconformity a respectable and impotent tradition. Dissent, then, is ceasing to interest our politicians, and, worse still, its claims are not so readily admitted as formerly by wealthy old ladies and other subscribers to "good causes." Denominational concerns seem to appeal to an ever-narrowing circle. Your average subscriber likes a broader cause, a wider interest. He suspects a fund which will benefit only the Elect; he prefers some institution with a scope as wide as humanity, even if its function be as shallow as his own convictions. The Y. M. C. A. threatens to oust the Missionary Societies. The Red Cross is worshipped by some instead of the True Cross. For, so the argument runs, your True Cross appeals only to Christians, but the arms of the Red Cross are as wide as humanity, and under it Jews, Turks, infidels and heretics may also shelter. Our mania for big things has got into our religion, and we sniff at Dissent because it is comparatively small.

Most of this indifference to Nonconformity is due to the general indifference to Christianity itself. If people are not caring for our Christian Faith as a whole, they are not likely to be interested in any particular expression of it. That there is sometimes a more worthy motive, we may gladly recognise. Some of us care less for Nonconformity as such than our fathers did, not because we care little for Christianity as a whole, but because we care

everything for it as a whole. We are so impressed by our unity with other Christians, so anxious for co-operation against our common foe, that we are inclined to treat our differences as what the diplomatists would call "regrettable incidents." This may or may not be a sound method of procedure; it is at least a respectable one and there can be no doubt that squabbles between various branches of the Church are a needless luxury, a luxury that ought to be abandoned in these hard times. When everyone professed Christianity they might perhaps be tolerated, but today when the Church commands the allegiance of a small minority we simply cannot afford such things. The prospects of Nonconformity are black indeed; it does not seem likely to survive for long unless some change comes. We may at least be sure of this: if we care little for the future of our denominations, other people will care nothing. Nonconformity will not live on its past, however glorious. In the brutalized and disillusioned world which will be left after the war conditions will be most antagonistic to any sort of Christianity, but Christianity of the Nonconformist kind will be most particularly at a disadvantage. Dissent will not survive of itself, without an effort; no Church (if Sir John Seeley's words may be parodied) will be safe that is not enthusiastic. The men who have lived on the battlefields, away from all the traditions and atmosphere of Protestant England, will not be induced easily to respect religious conventions and respectabilities unless it is clear that these really represent vital things. In the flames of hell that have ruined our civilization, much wood and hay and stubble will have been consumed, and the question for us is: Will Nonconformity be amongst the rubbish? What does it mean to us today? Does it mean anything that is vital, essential, eternal? Does it mean anything at all?

To a casual observer it is difficult to see that modern Dissent does mean anything distinctive. It means Chris-

tianity, of course, but so does the Established Church. The peculiar marks of Dissenting Christianity, the things that gave it a flavour of its own, the qualities that made it worth preserving have been almost all removed; they can still be traced in some of our older people, but what is there that marks the average, youngish Dissenter from the rest of professing Christians? The average Dissenter attends Divine Worship (irregularly, as the average Anglican) in a building which is as bad an attempt to copy medieval Gothic architecture as the highest of high Churches over the street. Where are those delightful old tabernacles, whose sturdy columns covered with yellow paint, proclaimed their independence of all mundane standards, civil or ecclesiastical? They have disappeared, or are fast disappearing. The tragedy goes on under our eyes even in Cambridge. Our new Chapels—which confound the beholder when he tries to classify them and discover what they can possibly represent—are the lineal successors of old buildings which would have been recognized for Dissenting Chapels in the streets of Pekin or the Vatican gardens. The buildings have changed, so have the names. Instead of calling them Ebenezer, Bethel, Zion, and Salem, we are gradually reconciling ourselves to the saints, at least for the purposes of nomenclature. And in a few years no doubt a Chapel christened after a public house will be a barbarous vulgarism too horrible to be contemplated. Yet good men worshipped in Red Lion Street Chapel and were not ashamed.

Inside our buildings it is the same: the distinction between the Anglican services and our own is less and less perceptible. We use fonts and lecterns; we sing psalms —it is true that we save our faces by using the Authorized instead of the Prayer Book Version—we pretend to make responses; and some of our choirs can render an anthem which is as unintelligble to the general congregation as any you will hear in the best cathedrals. We cannot now tolerate those long and intricate expositions of the Word

which used to be the glory of the historic Dissent; we would excuse the minister's discourse being as fatuous as that of some curates if only it were as short. The more fastidious among us kneel for prayer; that peculiar and most uncomfortable crouching position which used to be the hall-mark of Dissenting devotion is despised as vulgar and irreverent. We cannot claim to be enthusiastic about the characteristic features of Dissenting worship, though some of us are enthusiastic in destroying them.

In conduct as in worship it is now difficult to see for what Dissent stands. All the old standards, all the marks which distinguished us from the Anglican, all the things which gave us a right to exist, have disappeared—at least for the younger generation. The ban has been removed from novels and the theatre, from dancing and whist. (Bridge is perhaps still questionable!) If we do not observe saints' days, we can at least defile the Sabbath with the gusto of the Episcopalians. We use the Bible no more, if we use the Prayer Book less, than do our brethren. Indeed the old advantage of belonging to the Established Church has gone, for we Dissenters can be what our fathers would have called as "worldly" as any other members of Christ's Church. That stricter rule of life, that more exacting standard of character have been laid aside as needlessly "narrow" and superstitious. We cannot claim, therefore, that we are Dissenters for any of these reasons, nor can we ask that Dissent should survive as the custodian of its ancient traditions of public worship and private life, for we have recently sacrificed them of our own will. Dr. Horton has expressed this change in an allegory which is worth repeating.[1] The Spirit of Modern Progress one day called up a human being and finding him discontented gave him various things to make his life comfortable: beautiful cities, electric light, modern plumbing, telephones, telegraphs, motor

[1]My Belief, p. 249.

cars, comic operas, and steam yachts. Then said the Spirit, "Do you desire still more?" and the human being replied, "Yes, make my religion more comfortable." "That is simplicity itself," answered the Spirit, and thereupon he gave the human being magnificent Churches, good preachers, and twenty-minute sermons. "And now," asked the Spirit, "are you satisfied at last, or is there something else yet lacking to your happiness?" "Yes," was the answer, "my conscience troubles me, make that comfortable." "That is the easiest thing of all," said the Spirit. And thereupon he did away with the personal Devil and gave the human being an easy going summer and a hell that makes a comfortable winter-resort. At that the human being fell back in his easy chair, and remarked: "Really, my dear Spirit, you have made religion so comfortable that I shall hardly need to think of it," and he buried himself in the Sunday newspaper.

The Spirit of Modern Progress has been making these improvements in Nonconformity as well as elsewhere, and we cannot claim to exist because we alone have resisted him.

But it will be said Nonconformity has stood for much more than all this. In the nineteenth century it preserved public spirit; it fostered political freedom; it maintained intellectual liberty; it defied a renascent feudalism. It is true that Dissent has performed all these valuable functions in the past, but no one of them is a guarantee of its future, for on closer examination we shall see either (1) that Dissent no longer does these services alone, they can go on without it; or (2) that there is not now the same need for such services to be done at all.

Look at the towns first. In the towns of Victorian England much of the strength of Dissent came from those middle-class tradesmen who had a taste for intellectual pursuits, from the people who read Scott and Dickens and Tennyson, who bought Cassell's *Popular Educator*

and read Benjamin Franklin's *Autobiography*, those pushful aggressive souls, canonized for all time in Smiles' *Self-Help*. These people when they turned to religious affairs wanted a longer, more intellectual discourse than the Parish Church provided. They had an idea too that they needed something more up-to-date, less hidebound, less obscurantist than a service which was a revival of medieval pomps and vanities. They felt it an insult to be tied down to the Apostles' Creed or the XXXIX. Articles, and they gloried in the freer air of the Chapel. These worthy people had moreover a great "interest," as they called it, in "public causes," and to these same causes the atmosphere of Dissent was far more sympathetic than was that of the Church. Temperance Societies, Missionary Societies, Settlements in the Slums and such things were supported far more vigorously by the Nonconformist Churches than by the Establishment. The most eager workers in social and philanthropic work in the nineteenth century were Dissenters, and they gave to Dissent a peculiar attraction which it cannot now claim. The Established Church has recovered itself; it has developed a social conscience; and the fact that a man is interested in humanitarian work is no longer a reason for his being a Dissenter. That source of our denominational strength is gone—and we are glad to think so.

Moreover, the middle classes of today do not feel that same leaning to Dissent which their predecessors felt. They are not so serious. They do not read Dickens or Scott or Tennyson, nor any of their modern equivalents (if there be any). They prefer Cassell's Magazine to the *Popular Educator*, and they have never heard either of Benjamin Franklin or of Samuel Smiles. The very solidity and intellectuality of the Dissenting sermon (as contrasted with the Anglican) is for these people not a recommendation, but a disadvantage. They are bored by careful exposition and annoyed by eloquent appeals.

Dissent no longer commends itself to the doubter as a half-way house between frank infidelity and the high-flying dogmatism of the Establishment and St. Athanasius. Today if people are sceptical enough to leave the Parish Church for theological reasons, they do not usually take to Dissent as a rationalized equivalent for the Catholic Faith. Their objections are generally developed too far for that and they renounce the whole business.

In the country conditions are different, but they are little better for Nonconformity. Those of us who live in the country at times of General Elections receive from curious sources much information about the virtues and uses of Dissent. If we cared to believe it we might hear from the lips of some devout Anglican peeress that the greatest service the village Dissenters had done for England was to maintain a belief in Free Trade and Universal Suffrage; or an agnostic barrister will assure us that the real reason that the pure word of God has been faithfully preached since 1662 in the Independent Chapel is that the clique of Dissenters may form a solid nucleus for a Liberal Club in the district. We have heard this so often that we have almost ceased to believe that anything is meant (except, Vote for Mr. So-and-So), yet there *is* a significance behind such blasphemy. Village Nonconformity has been the most formidable opponent of squirearchy and the old-fashioned Toryism. The square barnlike Chapels with their purple and yellow window-panes, their curious straight-backed seats and galleries resting on iron pillars hideously painted to represent marble—these Bethels and Ebenezers have represented more than a lack of artistic taste. They have served for generations as the rallying point for all men with a mind of their own, who were resolved not to sell their souls and bodies to the squire and the parson. Village Dissent in the nineteenth century meant that at least.

We cannot honestly say that it does today in anything

like the same degree. The villages are changed. The squire is quite often a wealthy Dissenter himself, and if formerly people went to Chapel to avoid the squire's tyranny—at least one day a week—they might now stay away for the same reason. Even where the old family still lives at the Manor or the Grange and still professes an attachment to the Parish Church, it is unlikely that the young squire is a persecuting Anglican. He does not sit in his pew on Sunday morning marking down the recusants in his black book; most likely he divides his time between his Sunday paper and his motor bike. It does not follow that village Dissent means nothing today; but it does follow that the Chapel is not so necessary as a protection against feudalism as once it was. If *that* was its supreme function, its days are numbered.

Today then, Dissent no longer represents so fully or so exclusively many of the things which it represented in the nineteenth century. Time and social changes have undermined many of its claims upon the allegiance of our people. It is no longer so vigorous or so necessary as the guardian of political and intellectual liberty; it is no longer remarkable for the strictness of its rules of conduct, or the simplicity of its worship; and the result of all this is that Dissent has come both in town and country to have a curiously Victorian appearance. It seems to represent the aspirations and necessities of a generation just dead—much as silk hats and hansom carriages do. Mr. Spurgeon preaching in the Crystal Palace, everyone will admit, did represent a great force in Victorian England, but the twentieth century seems to have almost as little use for Mr. Spurgeon's successors as for the Crystal Palace. Both seem rather antiquated, yet neither has the charm of romance. There have consequently been several attempts to bring both up to date. Some enthusiasts have wished to revive interest in Nonconformity by striking an alliance between it and the Labour Party; they have wanted to make Dissent stand

at least for one real craving of our own generation—social reform. Others have tried to infuse Dissent with the theology which is known technically as "Liberal" and popularly as "New." Neither effort has been a success, and the real significance of Dissent for the twentieth century is still somewhat obscure. It may be a noble historic monument, it may be a white elephant; it does not seem —anyhow—to be very much alive.

Yet some of us are not prepared to give up Dissent as a lost cause. We are not content to have it classed amongst those mysterious fads of our ancestors which mean nothing to the new generation. We are convinced that it means something for own own time, that it means intensely and means well; to find its meaning is our meat and drink. We are not really sorry that all those temporary attractions which once helped to make Dissent popular are now passing away. We want to see what is really at the bottom of it all, and we should have been ashamed to find that Dissent existed principally for social and philanthropic purposes, that its real purpose was to serve as a Sunday club for intellectual people, a rural organization of the Liberal Party or even a sort of glorified chaplain to the Labour Party. We suspected that, although Dissent might for the time assume any of these strange guises, it was really—at bottom—a Church. Most of us have, nevertheless, been in danger of confusing it with the many causes which it supported in the nineteenth century with this result: those causes being dead, we are inclined to believe Dissent must die too.

Now, we are really Dissenters not because we are Liberals or Socialists, teetotals or intellectuals, fanatics or fair-minded people, but because we are Churchmen. We cannot support the Anglican Establishment, because we believe in the Holy Catholic Church. Historically, as everyone knows, Dissent came into existence because certain men were Calvinists. They believed that the Church was composed of the Elect, so many and no more.

They quarrelled with the Elizabethan Church settlement and the Stuart Kings not primarily because they liked gowns better than surplices, sitting better than kneeling, preaching better than praying—the real point of the quarrel was the clash of ideas about the Church. To the Anglican the Church was and is the spiritual organization of the nation, the religious aspect of the parish. It included every baptized person and it represented the spiritual side of humanity. "No," said the Dissenting Calvinist, "No, a thousand times. The Church is not the spiritual aspect of the world or of humanity. It has nothing to do with either. The world, the nation, and the parish are vain temporary things; the Church is eternal, foreordained before all worlds. Baptism is performed by men, the Church is called of God. The Church is not the world organized for religious purposes, it is God's dynamite to destroy the world."

This is what Dissent originally meant, this is what it must still mean. If it *did* still mean this, we should at least know that it stood for something. It would not mean merely a disapproval of the loose connection between the Established Church and the Government of England, a connection which in these godless days would never be allowed to exist at all if it had any real significance. If Dissent only means that we disapprove of that vain shadowy connection we cannot expect it to be very vigorous, or to command the attention of people who are interested in the real forces of modern life and not in the curious relics of seventeenth century quarrels. If Dissent stands for no more than the Liberation Society, "to free Religion from State patronage and control," we must not expect any more enthusiasm for Dissent than is accorded to the Liberation Society.

But it must be repeated, Dissent does mean something more than this. We disapprove of the connection between the Church and the State, the Church and the world, only because we disapprove of the State and the

world themselves. We are Dissenters, not from the doctrines of the Prayer Book, but from the doctrines of all modern civilization; from those heresies which have contaminated the Church and ruined the world; from the belief that Christianity is simply the top-stone of culture —a part of the Oxford manner—from that short-sighted view which assumes that happiness comes by making the best of this world instead of by renouncing it and all its methods; from that blind optimism which trusts in some magical law of progress, which sits down to watch shellfish develop into men by way of sea monsters, and then hopes that men will develop into angels by way of social reformers. From all such nonsense we utterly dissent. The world, we say, lies in the arms of the wicked one, man is damned and "humanity" with him. He will not save himself, he will never attain peace, in the natural course of events he is bound for hell, and nothing can stop him—nothing save the grace of God, preached in the Gospel and crystallized in the Church. The hope of society is not in the education, the aspirations, not even in the enfranchisement of the millions, it is in the salvation of the few. As Dissenters, as Free Churches, we ought to refuse to be side tracked by any schemes which do not recognize our fundamental principles.

We have been in danger of losing this faith of ours, but the war, it may be hoped, will show us that the old Dissenters were right, that they gave us a Faith worth retaining. We had ceased to see much use for the Church because we had become so hopeful of the world; we had lost our faith in God, because we had so much faith in man. Our failure is now apparent, and Dissent is justified. The true Dissenter alone has a right not to be dumbfounded by this shattering of Europe; he, alone, has an honest right to say: "I told you so." He has never put his faith in the gradual evolution of the highest life, in education, in civilization, in the uplifting tendency of the mutual intercourse of nations, in the growth of a

sentiment of the brotherhood of man, in the force of enlightened public opinion and self-interest. These idols of the world never appealed to him. Now they have fallen he is not alarmed, he is not even surprised; *his* cause is vindicated. It is from all these things he has always dissented, for all these things rested on the belief that man and this world are good, that, given a chance, they will develop all right. *That* was never the Dissenter's belief, and now that the heart of man has been proved once more to be desperately wicked, and the world has shown once more that it is possessed of an infinite capacity for going wrong, the Dissenter is prepared to begin all over again. But he will begin in his own way:—renunciation, not amelioration, of the world; transformation, not development, of the individual.

The Calvinistic phraseology in which our forefathers expressed themselves about these matters may strike us as rather unpleasant, and it is not necessary to plead that we should use it; but it is necessary that we should realize the greatness, the goodness, the high daring of the Faith which our dissenting predecessors held—the Faith that set the world at defiance, which refused all plausible and probable means of improving men, saying outright that unless they were in living communion with Christ it mattered little how intelligent, how enlightened, how spiritual they might be; preferring a squalid meeting-house with none of the traditions and few of the decencies of European life to an august body however Catholic, apostolic, episcopal, rational, parochial, æsthetic, or patriotic. According to our Dissenting Faith it is useless to try to serve men with all the graces and delicacies of Christian civilization until the root of the matter is inside them. We are convinced that a small Church in touch with our Saviour is more beneficial to the world than a whole Parliament of well-meaning persons, attempting to whitewash sepulchres, attempting to make humanity virtuous by pretending it is so. We are more

concerned to bring a few people into that little flock to which the Kingdom is promised, than to force the blessings of the Kingdom on the many who do not acknowledge the King. We believe that the desert of this world is made to blossom by those who frankly confess that it *is* a desert, by those who own themselves strangers and pilgrims seeking a better country, by those who have their citizenship in heaven; we believe that our guilty civilization will yet be saved by those who answer the call "Come ye out of her and be ye separate." In short we Dissenters are (or ought to be) a "peculiar people," and if the world sees little use for us, it is because we are not peculiar enough. When our Churches are patronized by Mayors and Aldermen, when they are classed with Friendly Societies and Model Public Houses as "forces which tend to uplift the life of society," we ought to tremble for our Dissenting souls; we ought to examine ourselves and see whether we still stand in the Nonconformist Faith. For it is not our mission to uplift the life of society; that we can leave well enough to the Friendly Societies and the Model Public Houses; our mission is to smash the society of men and establish the Communion of Saints, small perhaps and poor—but the real thing and therefore more valuable than all else.

This is the challenge which Dissent must again offer to the world. We may be happy to think it will be most unpopular in a world which persists in trying to save itself along the old lines. England, we are told by one school, is to be saved by her own exertions, by "preparedness," by the teaching of patriotism to children, by courage, by industry, by stedfastness, finally by conscription. This will be the message of many teachers for the next twenty years, and to this message we may well fear that the Anglican Church will be content to affix its seal. It will again act in its historic capacity as the chaplain of the nation. There will be another school of teachers who will oppose all this, who may for that reason

deceive some even of the Elect, but who are none the less abhorrent to the spirit of true Dissent, for they too teach the salvation of the world by its own good works. This second school is that self-styled party of "advanced" thinkers, the humanitarians, the political pacifists, the internationalists, those who are roughly represented in this century by the Union of Democratic control as they were represented in the nineteenth century by the Great Exhibition of 1851. They would save us by unpreparedness, instead of preparedness, by teaching not patriotism but the "Great Illusion," making us love our brothers in Germany whom we have not seen since we cannot love our brothers in England whom we do see.

There is much to make us pessimistic about the future of Dissent, but when we consider these alternatives—devotion to the nation or devotion to humanity in general—we are grounded in the faith that to be a Dissenter is the one thing that will be worth while in the next twenty years. Devotion to our own nation, devotion to our common humanity will not save us from a repetition of these horrors. Only the Church will save us, and *outside the Church—no salvation;* that is our Dissenting creed and that challenge reiterated would put some meaning into our Dissent. We Dissenters are High Churchmen, we believe intensely in the Church, the supernatural Church. We will not degrade it by Establishment to be the helpmeet, the spiritual shadow of the State; we cannot regard it as one society among others, worthy, perhaps, of our patronage and deserving, at least, of our kindly criticism. We set the Church alone, first, everywhere; for us it is no human association built upon earth by men for mutual improvement, it is the New Jerusalem that lieth four square, descending out of heaven from God.

CAMBRIDGE.

Catholic Protestantism

By Dugald Macfadyen, M. A., F.R. Hist. S.
Late Minister of South Grove Congregational Church, Highgate, London.

I

To be permanent a church must be catholic; to be alive it must be evangelical; to be progressive it must be free. These are the three essentials for the continuity of church life. The first deals with the past. No church can afford to cut itself off from the faith, the struggles, the heroisms, and the solid gains of the past. It must have deep roots if it is to have strong branches. The past must live in its bones—not necessarily on the surface. It must be able to claim its heritage in the best that has gone before. Whether it recites creeds or not, it must possess the creeds which represent the replies of the faithful to the heresies of other days. The devotions of the living-dead must be alive in its hymns, and the prayers of the saints must live in its devotions. It ought not to cut itself adrift from any of the achievements in architecture, education, painting, theology, or institutions which represent the stored faith and love of past generations of Christian men and women.

But no church can live upon its past. To be alive it must be evangelical. It must be creating Christian character. The whole vitality of a Christian church depends on the directness of its contact with the living Christ. Jesus Christ is both founder and foundation, and a church which has severed itself from its foundation is "in the air." The power that enriches a church with vitality is essen-

tially the Christ power present in its midst. No church is dead which is doing the works of Christ. No church is living which is not producing the fruits of that vital contact. The Christ contact produces the Christ view of the world. The Christ presence produces the Christ relations to God and man. Men and women who are "in Christ" see all men in God and God in all men. They are not afraid to labour and suffer and die for the redemption of humanity. They work for the city which hath foundations whose builder and maker is God. St. Paul saw, with the eye of a statesman, that the Christ-spirit—once manifested in Jesus—was a world principle of unity, vitality and perpetual renewal. Men steeped in that spirit are at the heart of all that religion has to offer. They are living in a world governed by principles directly antagonistic to the principles which bring disorder, rivalry, jealousy, confusion in the everyday world. They are translated into the Kingdom of a Redeemer and are therefore pledged to the world's redemption. Nothing can kill a church so ruled and guided. It is "alive for evermore," and wholly alive, body and soul, in its immediate present.

To possess the future a church must be progressive and to be progressive it must be free. It is the perpetual endeavour of human nature to keep things fixed. It is the perpetual trend of life to keep them fluid. Human nature is always trying to rivet the bondage of the past on the present. Old creeds, old hymns are most loved by old men, and in religion old men are always in the seats of the mighty. The result is that the young faith of a church is constantly shooting past the standards of the established religion of its time. Achievements into which the past generation put all its energy and faith are taken as the starting point of the next generation—and if room is not found for growing aspiration and faith they go outside the church for expression and find other channels in which to run. Therefore freedom is essential. At a great price freedom has been purchased, and there must

be no quarter given to any attempt to put it back into strait-waistcoats, even of most superlative antique, or mediaeval manufacture. It may be admitted that no church completely satisfies these essential requirements, but some churches are nearer than others, and all churches may come to have them, when they agree as to what are the vital forces of religion and agree to give them their true weight in forming and guiding their faith, worship and institutions.

II

Historically the Congregational Churches represent the oldest form of English Nonconformity. They are exactly as old as the modern Anglican Church. Up to the time of the Reformation the faith and practice of Anglican and Congregationalist were equally in the loins of the Church which represented British Christianity. Both Churches alike were undifferentiated tendencies in a common stock. The same parliamentary and ecclesiastical discussions which led to the definition of Nonconformity, led to the definition *per contra* of Anglicanism, and vice versa; it was indeed this effort which made Anglicanism a more or less conscious entity—a compromise between the Roman type and the new reformed type.

Much has been done in recent years to show how much English Christianity owes to Celtic missionaries like Aidan, Columba, Adamnan, and the rest. Place names and names of local churches in the North and Midlands bear this contention out. In many places the name is commemorated of some English saint, who was simply a man or woman who led the way in a humanitarian reform, such as the saving of exposed children, or who in some similar way carried a stage higher the rising tide of Christian morality and spiritual principle. An English saint is generally a man or woman who made a new application of Christianity to the special circumstances of his time.[1]

[1]Adamnan *e.g.*, secured the passing of a law forbidding women to take part in battle.

These men are not the property of any single Church. They are the common possession of the Church of Christ in these islands. Dean Henson's school has succeeded in showing how largely English Christianity developed in freedom from Roman influence, and all that he has done has emphasized the point that the characteristic feature in our national religion was the interpretation of the Christian religion as a morality which issues in a spiritual life. The ritualism and ceremonialism of Rome, its doctrinal absolutism, and its ascetic discipline have never had any strong hold on the English mind. Religion to us has always meant something which touches human experience more closely, bringing God nearer and making human life better. This tendency, which is as old as the record of English religious life, is the tendency which culminated in the Reformation, and ultimately in Puritan Nonconformity. Puritanism would never have been able to carry the country so far with it as it did, if its roots had not been deep seated. The mere points of ritual on which it stood were trivial as compared with the tendencies it represented, and especially the stubborn English tendency not to be put off with superficialities and forms—demanding that religion should be less a beautiful convention or a treasured tradition than a life, an act, a fact, an experience, a regulative and reformative power in the hearts of the people.

It is important to recall that early Nonconformists were drawn from the stock of British Christians. From Cartwright to John Robinson they were mainly men educated in English Universities, imbibing more than they knew of the best Christian traditions of the country. This partly explains why they were men of richer mental and spiritual gifts than their followers. They dissented from the Church of England because they had assented to a larger truth about the Church of Christ. They long hoped to bring the whole Church to their mind. Like all reformers they assumed that the faith they held had only

to be stated clearly to win universal adherence. We know that in some respects they were wrong. We know that they overvalued the possibilities of independent action and undervalued the importance of that common stock of faith and morals which runs down the ages in a Church by the channels of example, influence, heredity, tradition, and direct teaching. But in the main they were right in their views of the meaning of Christianity. The Church of England has gradually assimilated their views. It is kept alive by coming into line with the popular conviction that Christianity is not a ceremonial observance, but a spiritual religion linked with and approached by an elevated morality.

The psychology of a reform movement is almost always the same. The reformers have, let us say, seven points of agreement and three points of difference with the body from which they separate. The main body of their belief is already part of the creed of the Church from which they spring. But certain other points have become all important to them, and these they have to emphasize. This emphasis is important for the moment, but it is not permanently of solitary importance in relation to the whole body of belief. The Puritans differed from the Anglicans, but they were in much closer agreement with the Anglicans than they were with atheists or free thinkers. They had learned in the Church from which they sprang the Christian outlook on the world, though they differed as to the effects of that faith on the constitution of the Church. If the Christian Church were free to follow its own genius without hindrance from vested interests and artificial organizations, what would happen is quite clear. The original body would assimilate the points of view of the reformers and then the division would be healed. This would be all the easier because in most cases the points of difference arise out of fresh discoveries in the Bible or in the values of faith. They are points of difference merely because the original body of believers has

never discussed them or considered them. When consideration takes place it is in an atmosphere of hostility rather than of reasonable and friendly debate. The classic case is the Council of Trent, when the Roman Church defined its position on a large number of questions which had never been even discussed at any previous council, and did so by simply defining a negative of the Lutheran and Reformed positions. But many cases, notably in Methodism and more recently in Presbyterianism, have occurred, where the responsible leaders of the Church have accepted the principles involved in a conscientious division, and then restored the divided body of believers to its original place in the unity of the Church. The important fact in all such fragments of Church history is that the common element of the Christian faith is always larger than the dividing principle.

In the present condition of the public mind all who hold that faith in God which is through Jesus Christ as Lord, have more in common with one another than they can have with those who have accepted a materialistic philosophy, a scientific creed, and a merely individualistic, egotistic, and mercenary code of morality. This has always been true of British Christianity. A Christian of any denomination would rather see England Catholic than see it atheistic if the choice had to be made. We have more in common with the crudest and most mutilated form of Christianity than with the cultured barbarism which sees life shorn of all spiritual meaning and moral control, as a mere battle of the beasts for the means of living.

British Christianity has a history of its own which still remains to be written. It has its own characters and characteristics, distinguishing it sharply from Gallic, Teutonic, or Italian Christianity. It is a tree with many branches, but all the branches spring from a common stem. The so-called histories of Congregationalism are too local, personal and picturesque to supply the place of a

veritable history. A full history would be a history of ideas rather than persons, of tendencies and principles, rather than a collection of interesting biographies. Congregationalism finds its place in history as one interpretation of the Christian religion—an interpretation which has presented itself repeatedly to congenial minds in generation after generation. It requires to be reset in its proper place as an integral portion of the history of Christianity in England—a limb in the body of Christ. We do not claim more for it than this, and we cannot claim less. Congregationalism has no claim as a system if it really began with Robert Browne or any other person in its history. It has a permanent right to live as an interpretation of the religion of the New Testament.

III

The catholicity of Congregationalism is essential, inherent and permanent, and arises from the nature of Christianity itself. If Christianity is a redemptive system it requires redeemed men to maintain it. If it is an ethical religion it requires men of character to illustrate it. If it is a spiritual religion it must invite spiritually-minded men and women to appreciate it. In such a system apostolic order does not depend on a continuous ritual, or the proved antiquity of a ceremonial. Religion is an interpretation of life. Christianity is a specific attitude in religion, and the faith of a Congregationalist is a specific affirmation of the meaning of Christianity. It is of the essence of the matter that this is not a merely subjective affirmation of a personal predilection. The Congregationalist is as objective as the Romanist, but instead of affirming his submission to an objective ritual or church order, he makes the much larger affirmation of the objective character of the ethical and spiritual system which Jesus Christ declared to exist. To those who approach Christianity from this standpoint, Jesus is not a teacher, but a revealer. He unveils moral facts and

spiritual existences which have an objective existence. His "yea" and "nay" are not the assertions of a rabbi to be treasured like the sayings of Hillel or Shammai; they are the revelation of something fundamental in the nature of the universe. The Son's faith in the Father, His confidence in the many mansions of eternity, are more than portions of a creed we learned from Him; they are visions of realities which men may also experience; they are as much His discovery of new continents for human experience as Columbus' discovery of America. It is not Jesus who teaches these things. It is God who discovers Himself thus to Jesus, and henceforth these belong for us to the very nature of God's universe in which we live. The Christian life ceases to be a traditional walking in the steps of ancestral devotion; it is a life lived in conscious relation to certain revealed facts which change the meaning of life. The Christian is the man who has made a revaluation of life in the light of these facts, and when he has done so no church can unchurch him. The idea of the Congregational church is to form a society in which nothing shall diminish or interfere with the full force of the Christ truths.

It lives by:

> The authentic sign and seal
> Of Godship, that it ever waxes glad
> And more glad, until gladness blossoms, bursts,
> Into a rage to suffer for mankind
> And recommence at sorrow.

It is a consequence of this position, essentially Catholic, that there is no necessity to make the faith in God which is through Jesus Christ a badge of exclusion. It is a magnetic centre, not a barrier. The Christ life was in existence before Jesus Christ revealed its true nature. Prophets saw it as real and existent, and psalmists sang of it before Jesus was born in Bethlehem. The Christ life did not cease to be when Jesus was crucified on Calvary. It is objective, abiding, permanent, in the spiritual

kingdom, though to us Jesus is its unique and perfect exponent. Men may get glimpses of it through many windows, though it is Jesus who sets it in the full light of day. Men are brought under its influence by a thousand channels whenever they get a sense of the abiding ethical and spiritual existences which are graven into the very being of the universe.

It was a striking act of trust in God and humanity to conceive a church where spiritual affinities would be the only and permanent bond of union—where there should be no constraint but the constraint of ethical consanguinity, no ties but the ties of conscious adhesion to the truth, no dynamic but the love of God, and no driving force but the force which Christ exercises on the minds of those who love Him.

IV

In the last resort a church lives by direct relation to Christ. The world is not interested in churches but it is interested in Christ. Even the interest in the historical Jesus—though that is greater than the interest in any other figure in the world's history—is secondary to the interest in Jesus as the Christ. This paragraph is written on the eve of Whitsunday—the first great historical demonstration that the Christ-spirit could come into humanity and transform it. This great discovery of which our New Testament is the authentic record is the source of all vitality and vigour in the Christian church. The Christ-formed man is the world's most precious possession. He is the source of all renewal and recreation in a world which reels more and more under titanic burdens of disappointment, delusion and despair. It is the immense privilege of every Christian church to hold the secret of this supreme power. A church lives by the freedom of access which it offers to Christ. This is not now a matter of faith. It is the testimony of world-wide experience. Whether the contact comes through worship, through fellowship with

saintly lives, or through the sacrament, the vital thing is that there should be real contact. Humanity is known to be *capax deitatis*—the deity may take possession and use these minds, these wills, these hearts for the supreme work of human redemption. No wonder that men hope on, and pray on, and seek on for "the day" in their own lives and churches when this supreme experience shall be verified. That hope keeps churches in existence.

The great endeavour which is so imperfectly expressed in Congregationalism was to create a church which should be "simply Christian." Experience has shown the enormous difficulties of this in practice, but the ideal still holds the field. Congregational churches have held aloft a standard round which all churches can rally. Kindred churches bring with them gifts which Congregationalism has disregarded and qualities which it does not possess, but they know that here its position is central. It is catholic in the broadest and truest sense of the term. It holds essential what is at the centre of all catholicism. It is at the heart of things.

V

All churches make their first impression on their public by their ideals and methods of worship. This has become increasingly important with the "speeding up" of modern life both in Europe and America. Busy men, thoughtful men, practical men have no time to burrow deep into the foundations of faith. They do not now discuss as they once did the points of a creed, and balance one creed and another with a view to finding out their preferences. They do not care much for the kind of demonstration from a pulpit which once obtained, that the creed of one church entitles its holders to a full salvation which is not guaranteed by other creeds. A church is judged by its acts of public worship—and the atmosphere which surrounds the worshippers when they meet in the presence of God. This change in the spirit

of the man in the street has done much to put all churches on one level. All creeds and systems are in fact represented by local groups of worshippers who meet at stated times for acts which are an expression of their faith. Worship should then be an intense and concentrated expression of a church's belief that it is then and there in the presence of God and that its worship is a real transaction between the people present and the God in whom they believe. Everything we know of God should have weight in determining the character of worship. If God is a God of order, it should be orderly. If He is a God of infinite Love, worship should be cheerful as when children come to a Father. If He is waiting to give us all the gifts of an infinite Lover and Giver, there should be opportunity for receiving such gifts and bearing witness to their reception. If He is a Holy God whose wrath rests on wrong-doing, there should be room for confession and penitence. If He is full of intelligence and thought, there should be enough stimulus for thought to make men intelligent. But whatever the method the whole purpose of worship fails if it does not bring men into the presence of God—and make Him not merely a reality, but a supreme and present reality. Whether this is a possible ideal under all systems of worship no single individual can say. It is at least open to affirm that it is possible to approximate to this ideal where the leader in worship, and all who take part in it are agreed as to the aims of worship, and do not greatly differ as to the most helpful methods. It should not be impossible to contribute and maintain Christian communities on the sound and generous lines of Sir James Stephens' definition: "As a science, religion consists in the knowledge of the relations between God and man; as a living principle, in the exercise of the corresponding affections; as a rule of duty in the performance of actions which those affections prescribe."[2]

[2]Sir James Stephen, "Essays in Ecclesiastical Biography." Vol. 1.

Christian Certainty and Gospel Preachers

By Francis J. Hall, D.D.,
General Theological Seminary, New York.

The purpose of this article is to discuss certain problems connected with the prophetic aspect of ministerial vocation and responsibility, problems which have been forced to the front by the rise of modern liberalism. The word liberalism is here used to denote the general point of view which leads men to claim the right to exercise the prophetic functions of the Christian ministry in what have been called "orthodox" Churches, independently of acceptance of the traditional and officially defined teaching of these Churches.

The writer's aim is constructive rather than controversial, although he cannot expect to avoid laying down propositions and conclusions which are to-day disputed by very earnest Christian men. The point of view which men assume determines in large measure what they can maintain with sincerity; and even if we are unable to understand their standpoint, neither the welfare of the Church nor our knowledge of their hearts justifies us in assailing their personal integrity.

1. *Truth Seeking and Truth Finding*

The duty of every man to seek the truth, until he finds it, at least so far as his providential opportunities permit, is not seriously questioned to-day. The basis of this obligation is the vital connection between our knowledge of, or convictions concerning, truth and our daily lives. Our

practical judgments in matters of vital importance are determined by the enlightenment of our consciences, and this means by our knowledge of the truths by which we ought to live.

Nothing is more fatal to spiritual growth than carelessness as to the truths by which its lines of success are determined. "Truth is mighty and will prevail." We can do everything with the truth, that is, everything given us to do; but we must be fighting a losing cause so long as we contend against it. And this is so whether we *think* we are on the side of truth or not. A spiritual life controlled or modified by error is in ultimate analysis a more or less unsuccessful life. Spiritual success is an obligatory aim of Christians, and therefore so much truth-seeking as is necessary for this success is also an elementary duty—a duty which no considerations can nullify or reduce.

It is not to be overlooked, however, that reasonably assured discovery of truth does, within the range of the truth thus thought to be discovered, terminate the obligation of seeking. It is not the *seeking* that is primary, so much as the *finding* of truth, for it is truth possessed and lived by, rather than truth still sought for, that enables us to guide our steps rightly toward God. Mere knowledge of truth, without spiritual application to life, is of course valueless. But ignorance of the truths by which our lives should be guided cannot but interfere with spiritual development. Truth-seeking, therefore, must terminate in truth-finding, if its labours are to be fruitful.

We also need to remember that truth-seeking, like every serious pursuit, has laws upon the observance of which its success depends. Among these laws is this, that truth already known is the road to truth still sought for. This is so because the realm of truth is at unity with itself, and each truth is involved in, and implied by, other truths. This law, and its widespread practical acceptance, is illustrated by the large part played in

scientific progress by working hypotheses, or propositions accepted as true for the purpose of wider investigation.

These hypotheses may, and sometimes do, undergo modification, as the result of increased knowledge; but in the meanwhile they embody real facts—truths—previously known. And this existing knowledge is not less valid and helpful in further truth-seeking, because the working hypothesis in which it is formulated has subsequently to be modified in order to embrace wider knowledge. If the hypothesis of gravitation were some day to require modification in the light of new data, this would not alter the fact that scientific investigation has been greatly facilitated by using the facts now generalized in it as a settled basis for further truth-seeking. That we must investigate the unknown from the standpoint of the known is too well established in theory and practice to be gainsaid.

And this law holds good in the sphere of belief as well as in that of knowledge. If we believe that certain things are so, especially if our belief appears to have a very reasonable and convincing basis, we are foolish to disregard this belief when we seek after truth in related fields of enquiry. Of course, our belief may be mistaken, and have to be modified, perhaps abandoned, at a later stage. None the less, if what is known to be true affords the proper standpoint for investigating the unknown, so what is thought to be true, in the absence of real knowledge, affords the *most promising* standpoint for such investigation. Some standpoint is indispensable, and the standpoint of an entirely empty mind is one to be remedied as quickly as possible. If we would go anywhere we must determine the direction of our steps from *some* where; and this is as true in the mental sphere as in the geographical.

2. *Openness of Mind*

This brings us to another requirement of truth-seeking, which is openness of mind, or readiness to recognize and

accept truth from whatever quarter it comes, however unexpected its tenor may be, and whatever may be its effects upon our previous convictions and postulates. In ultimate issues, there are no closed questions—no questions, that is, which we are debarred from reconsidering when new light is thrown on them.

There is, indeed, a relative sense in which we may speak of a closed question. To illustrate, so long as I believe that whatever Jesus Christ taught is necessarily true, I cannot consistently reject anything which I suppose Him to have taught, unless I am shown that He did not teach it. The principle is that, so long as I accept a postulate, the necessary deductions from that postulate remain for me closed questions. And it is in this sense that certain matters are said to be closed questions in the Church, that is, so long as the final teaching authority of the Church is accepted. But if truths are discovered by a believer in such authority which are demonstrably contrary to the Church's known teaching, he will be bound to reckon with them, even at the cost of modifying his acceptance of ecclesiastical authority. Anyone who thinks that he has found all spiritual truth, and has no more truth-seeking to do, is of course labouring under an illusion. The assurance of one who occupies the dogmatic standpoint does not imply such a mistake. It implies only his conviction that he has discovered central truths—truths which are determinative of the rest, and which therefore afford reasonable premises of his future thinking and safe guidance in his spiritual life.

To sum up, openness of mind means openness to all truth, and readiness to accept each new item of knowledge, both in itself and in its consequences, however radical these may prove to be. It does not mean, however, vacancy of mind, which belongs only to the densely ignorant and incompetent; nor, to use a phrase of President Butler, is it equivalent to a mind which is "open at both ends," that is, lacking an assured standpoint. This

standpoint will, indeed, be regarded by an open mind as subject to modification, when new data establish the need of this; but a really competent mind will not hastily abandon convictions, previously supposed to be well grounded, whenever propositions inconsistent with them are exploited in scholarly circles. It is unwise to attribute infallibility to scholarship. In some instances at least, its "assured results" have to undergo important modifications, and even have to be reversed. In brief, openness of mind, to be of service, should be combined with the stability of mind which cherishes previous mental possessions until their valuelessness is really established, and thus retains an intelligible and determinate point of view from which to reckon with what is new. It is not properly characterized by holding everything in solution, as if accepted conclusions were too uncertain to be used even provisionally and for working purposes.

3. *Religious Doubt*

A restless state of doubt is, for truth-seeking purposes, a misfortune rather than a necessary condition of sincere truth-seeking. Doubters are not always to blame for their mental unsettlement, which may be due to causes beyond their control; and either to profess a certainty which is wanting, or to shirk the task of facing mental difficulties and overcoming them in a reasonable way, is unjustifiable. To abandon all investigation and thinking in the interest of blind faith is a climax of unreason. But the fact remains that a general state of mental unsettlement is a misfortune, rather than a necessary and normal stage in the development of a reasonable and assured faith. A virile faith is no more dependent upon struggle through the torment of doubt than good physical health is contingent upon previous illness.

But it may be urged that, if a minister of the Gospel is to be adequately equipped for extending sympathetic help to doubters, he at least needs personal experience of

religious doubt. Otherwise, it is said, he cannot really appreciate the state of mind, and the difficulties, which it is his vocation to grapple with. This plea is more specious than valid. It assumes that the realizing sympathies of intelligently trained minds are wholly limited to the specific lines of their personal experience, which is not true. If it were true, no physician would be able to extend efficient help except so far as he had himself suffered from the diseases which he is invited to treat.

One does not need to experience the religious form of doubt in order to understand its torment and sympathize with the doubter. Doubt is a generic experience, common to every department of mental life, and it is sufficiently felt in some form or other by every human being. Accordingly, the only equipment needed for extending a helping hand to religious doubters is comprehended in (a) an intelligent mind, (b) sufficient acquaintance with the mental problems involved—an acquaintance available to all real students of current thought,—and (c) a sympathetic heart.

It goes without saying that the minister must himself be assured of the truth which the doubter needs to find, and must enjoy the assistance of God's Holy Spirit. And it frequently happens that these two things, an assured faith and divine grace, enable the minister of the Gospel to succeed where the so-called "expert" utterly fails. This is so because, in many instances, doubt is really caused by the lack of the higher spiritual standpoint from which difficulties are seen in their true perspective—seen to be due to non-significant intellectual fog or to an abnormal scrupulosity of mind. The scrupulous form of incredulity is often the symptom of a religiously diseased mind, one requiring spiritual rather than philosophical treatment.

What we have called a scrupulous mind is not to be confused with a sensitively conscientious mind; but is a mind that has lost sight of the wood for the individual

trees, one that is sensitive beyond reason—as if one should weigh steel rails with a jeweller's scales. A sensitive conscience and a sense of responsibility in truth-seeking are indispensable. But ability to apprehend large perspectives is also vital for success, along with readiness to put to proof what seems likely to be true, even though not fully demonstrated, by the only adequate test available—the test of thinking and living in obedience to its logical implications. The only final means of verifying truths not susceptible of abstract demonstration is to experiment with them as working hypotheses.

4. *A Teacher's Standpoint*

Scholarly experts do not always escape the narrowing effects of habitual thinking within specialized lines; and their very expertness in their chosen fields often hides from their minds their incapacity—their mental atrophy, so to speak—in the presence of problems lying beyond their special field of investigation. In particular, such experts frequently fail to realize the part played in the secular and religious progress of mankind by teaching which is based upon, and controlled by, assured conviction. Yet illustrations of this lie within their immediate observation; for it is the readiness of the world at large to accept the "results" of scholarly investigation, *when confidently proclaimed*, that prevents these results from being confined in their illuminative benefits to the limited circles of specialists. Obviously those who thus receive them, even though blessed with educated minds, are not competent, as a rule, to investigate for themselves.

Christianity would long ago have ceased to exist if the people to whom it was preached had not been convinced by the assurance with which its truths were proclaimed, and had not believed that its preachers were experts in the subject matters of their preaching. In the strictest sense of the word the historic faith of Christendom represents "results" of the experience and thinking of its orig-

inal propagandists—thinking, no doubt, that was guided by the Spirit, but real reflection upon things claimed to be actually observed. And the success of the Christian propaganda in a very large measure has been due to the personal assurance with which it has been promoted.

There is no more fatuous proposition than this, that successful Christian preaching can be had apart from the possession of settled convictions by Gospel preachers? And no more serious setback to the Christian propaganda could be imagined than what would ensue if these preachers were ordinarily trained to assume an attitude of mental suspense towards Christian doctrines, until they had completed an exhaustive investigation of their several foundations. No single life-time is sufficient for such a task; and if its fulfilment were necessary for confident assurance in teaching, the Christian pulpit would minister wholly to doubt, instead of to a victorious faith. Only one who denies the value of the Christian faith for mankind can consistently advocate the conversion of Gospel preachers into mere truth-*seekers*—seekers who have not yet *found* the truths which they are appointed officially to proclaim.

The assurance of a convinced Christian teacher is not equivalent to a closed mind. If any questions are closed to him, they need not be closed in any other than the relative sense already defined—closed in this sense, that until his fundamental belief in the divinely guaranteed truth of historical Christianity is changed, the characteristic doctrines of the Christian system are to be treated as free from doubt for him. Naturally, while in this state of mind, he will not be on an expectant lookout for difficulties, except for the purpose of reassuring others. But there is nothing in his assurance that will require him to close his mind to new knowledge—knowledge calculated, perhaps, to militate against Christian doctrine, and thus to call for a reconsideration on his part of his whole position. No doubt the foreseen unsettlement of his

whole life may tempt him, if he lacks moral courage, to evade the responsibility which new light brings. But to say that a Christian teacher's mind is necessarily closed to disturbing data—in particular when their consequences are seen to include the sacrifice of his previous means of subsistence—is equivalent to saying that his attitude towards truth is inevitably insincere.

I venture to think that an accusation of this kind condemns itself. But there is a standpoint, adopted by many to-day, which incapacitates the mind to do justice to those who occupy what is called the dogmatic point of view. This standpoint—whether called Ritschlian or pragmatist—is essentially agnostic. It postulates a denial of the intellectual validity, within the sphere of religion, of all propositions concerning what Christians have been wont to reckon as objective truth. Limitations of space preclude any discussion of this denial, except to call attention to its destructive and really anti-Christian tendency.

5. *Ecclesiastical Standpoint*

Christianity cannot be dissociated from its propaganda of objective truths—claimed to be divinely revealed, and thus to have been brought within the scope of human knowledge—without a revolutionary and subversive change in its historical nature. The apostles were quite unaware that their confident assertions of Gospel-truth were mere judgments of value, and the same is to be said of Christian preachers in general up to the present day. The Christian propaganda has never been that of inspirational estimates, true only in the sense of ministering to utilitarian ethics. It has always been the proclamation of truths confidently asserted to have been divinely revealed, and to be preached in obedience to a command given by the eternal Son of God to His Church.

The Christian Church has from apostolic days to the present time regarded itself as charged with an official

propaganda of Gospel truth. Even among denominations of post-mediaeval origin the idea of an organized propaganda of truths considered to be fully established has been generally retained. A contrary conception is modern, and has gained no important support within "orthodox" Churches until our own age. Ecclesiastical approval in these Churches has never been given to it; for toleration, even when widely practised, may be—in this case undoubtedly is—merely the exercise of patient discretion in ecclesiastical discipline.

The dogmas of the universal Church are simply protective definitions of accepted "results" of enquiry into the precise nature of important particulars of her traditional propaganda—definitions made only under the stress of rival propagandas among her people. No one is debarred from reinvestigating their correctness as definitions of the teaching originally committed to the Church; but official or ministerial participation in the Church's propaganda has always presupposed ability to proclaim the Church's declared faith without violation of the minister's personal convictions. Accordingly, if a minister of the Church becomes convinced that her propaganda is inconsistent with truth, his retention of a ministry which commits him to its support becomes an obvious anomally. The anomally may, and sometimes does, escape his observation, but it is very apparent to the generality of Christian believers and thinkers. Similarly, it is an anomally for any man to enter the ministry of a Church when his convictions will not permit him sincerely to teach what that Church appoints him to teach.

The validity of these contentions does not depend upon any particular view of ecclesiastical authority, beyond the elementary principle that acceptance of a Church's official ministry implies acceptance of that Church's official standards and requirements, in their ecclesiastically accepted meaning. It is the birthright of every man

to be true to his convictions, and to proclaim them on suitable occasions. But it is no man's birthright to use an official pulpit for propagating views inconsistent with its appointed purpose. The obligation to keep an open mind to truth we have seen to be elementary; but this obligation neither nullifies nor modifies the obligation to deal truly with official positions and duties. The nature of these duties is not modified by the ease with which the consequences of their disregard can be escaped, but only by constitutional action of the Church in which the questions involved arise.

6. *Conclusions Reached*

The conclusions reached in this paper may be summarized as follows.

(a) Truth-seeking is an obligation of vital importance, one which no conditions can nullify, and which terminates only when, and in so far as, truth is found.

(b) Conviction that truth in a given direction has been found will naturally and legitimately reduce the range of active truth-seeking in that direction, and will predispose the mind against reopening the questions involved; but not even a dogmatic standpoint can rightly interfere with reconsideration in the light of new data.

(c) Assurance that one has found the truth in a given direction carries with it the right to teach it as undoubtedly true; and this method of teaching is the normal condition of its success. It is the readiness of normal folk to accept teaching confidently given that largely explains the spread of enlightenment among men in general.

(d) An organized propaganda is as legitimate as is any form of teaching, and its right to protect its aim by definitions, and by stipulations imposed upon its official participants, is not open to serious question. A Christian Church is a propaganda of this kind.

(e) No man surrenders his right to seek truth and to preserve an open mind when he becomes a ministerial

agent of an ecclesiastical propaganda; but this right does not entitle him also to accept or retain a preaching office in the Church, when he cannot sincerely promote the doctrinal propaganda to which it pertains.

7. *Ministerial Training*

In relation to Christian doctrine at least, the Church's ministry is not constituted for truth-seeking purposes, but for teaching truths which are regarded as already ascertained and established. It is a vital part of a Church minister's equipment, therefore, that he shall be well assured that the doctrines committed to him to teach have really been found to be true, and possess both the abiding validity and the practical value which justify his devoting his life to their proclamation. His duties are by no means exclusively prophetic, and adequate ministerial training cannot safely be limited to the element with which we are here concerned. But if our argument has a sound basis, the importance of developing in candidates for the Church's ministry a deeply established certainty as to the system of truth to the teaching of which they are to be committed by their ordination is very great indeed.

In American practice, ministerial training is largely committed to Theological Seminaries, and these are of two kinds. Certain Seminaries are independent of ecclesiastical affiliation, and are not committed to any specific type of doctrine. With such institutions we are not here concerned, except to say that they are obviously not suited to the training of men in an assured and determinate faith.

It is with the other and larger class of Seminaries that we have to do, those established to prepare men for ministries in which determinate doctrine is to be taught. In particular, we are concerned with Seminaries which have some kind of ecclesiastical recognition, and which train men for the ministry of a particular Church.

The problems which a Seminary of this kind has to face

are largely pedagogical, as with other academic institutions; but they are not exclusively so, for its aim is both academic and ecclesiastical—not less vitally the latter than the former. And the ecclesiastical aim involves preparation of candidates for teaching the Church's doctrine. Thus a Seminary of this kind is committed, by virtue of its advertised status and function, to the postulate that the doctrine of the Church with which it is affiliated has been ascertained to be true.

The conclusion to which we are driven is that its whole course, so far as Christian truth is concerned, should be dominated by positive, constructive and fortifying methods. We do not mean that no pains should be taken to give its students an adequate acquaintance with modern thought and modern difficulties. This too is very important; and students should be trained to teach in terms adapted to the present state of knowledge and to existing forms of thought. But it is absolutely vital to the avowed purpose of a Church Seminary—the avowal of which is the condition of its ecclesiastical recognition—that it should not sacrifice the constructive and fortifying aspect of ministerial training to other ends.

The Orthodox Church of Antioch

By I. I. Sokoloff,
Professor in the Imperial Ecclesiastical Academy, Petrograd.[1]

I

The Orthodox Church of Antioch is the third of the autocephalous Orthodox Patriarchates of the East. Their canonical order is: Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch and Jerusalem. This order came down from the time of the Ecumenical Councils, being based on data of canonical importance.

At present the Patriarchate of Antioch comprises Syria, Cilicia, and parts of Mesopotamia, Kurdistan and Armenia. In olden times the Patriarchate was much larger, extending over Arabia, Iveria, now called Georgia and forming part of Russian territory, and all the East, by which were meant all the eastern countries into which Christianity penetrated by the efforts of Antioch preachers, that is Persia, Armenia, Central Asia, India and China. It is in connection with the ancient jurisdiction that certain titles are ascribed to the Patriarch of Antioch to this day when "Long Life" is officially sung to him during certain celebrations. His full title is as follows: Long life to Gregory, the most Blissful, most Divine and most Holy Patriarch of Antioch, the great City of the Lord, of Syria, Arabia, Cilicia, Mesopotamia, and all the East, to

[1] Translated by Vera Johnson.

the Father of Fathers, Pastor of Pastors, Bishop of Bishops, Thirteenth of the Apostles, our Father and Pastor.

The ancient glory of Orthodox Antioch began to wane in the middle of the seventh century, when, through the conquests of Mussulman Arabs, it lost its independence and fell under the Moslem dominion. In the eleventh century we see the ancient apostolic Patriarchate under the yoke of the Seljuk Turks, and later on, from the fourteenth century up to our day, under the yoke of the Ottoman Turks. Twelve centuries of uninterrupted subjection accompanied by the usual Mussulman oppression of and insults to Christians, brought the Church of Antioch to the last degree of destitution, exhausting its inner strength and reducing it to material poverty. At times its ecclesiastical organization showed hardly any signs of life, its spiritual life's fire smouldered feebly. Then, the power of growth inherent in the Orthodox Faith asserting itself, the Church of Antioch revived again to a life of prosperous and fruitful activity, enjoying whole periods of prosperous historical existence. In spite of the long centuries of storm and calamity in its external life, *the Orthodox Church of Antioch did not perish.* This is its song of victory sounded the world over to this day.

II

First of all should be mentioned an important change in the internal life of this Church which took place in its supreme hierarchy at the end of the nineteenth century. During almost the whole of the two last centuries the See of Antioch was occupied by Patriarchs of Greek nationality, in spite of the fact that the population consisted chiefly of Syrian Arabs. There even developed a special tradition founded on the precedents of the past, which allowed other Eastern Patriarchs, especially the Patriarch of Constantinople and his Synod, to take part in the patriarchal election of Antioch. The past even shows cases of the local hierarchy being disregarded and foreigners from

other Eastern Patriarchates being chosen. Time gradually proved that this procedure was not efficacious. It permitted the occurrence of certain slights of the autocephalous dignity of the Church; and, moreover, the Syrian and Arab natives of the land were not always satisfied with the rule of Greeks, surrounded by other minor hierarchs, also Greeks, who did not understand Arabic and took no interest in the welfare or the needs of the native population or the native Church. Gradually national self-consciousness awoke, influencing the growth among laymen and minor clergy of a protest against Greek hierarchy, foreign to the indigenous population in origin, language and moral attitude. The protest was supported by bishops who though Arab by birth received their chirotony from Greeks: Patriarch Hieracimos (1885–1891) and Patriarch Spiridonios (1891–1897). It ended in the Most Blissful Spiridonios being forced to give up his patriarchal throne in December 1897. During the new patriarchal election there was a long and persistent struggle between the Greek and Arabian Metropolitans, each party nominating a candidate of its own. Hierarchs of Greek birth referred to precedent, and were supported by the Patriarchs of Constantinople, Alexandria, and Jerusalem. Arab hierarchs, supported by their nation and the Turkish government, demanded that the new Patriarch should be one with his people in birth, language and national ideals, that he should be chosen from among the hierarchs of Antioch in accordance with the autocephalous dignity of the Church, that is, without any interference on the part of other Eastern Patriarchates. Owing to this struggle the See of Antioch remained vacant a long time. Meletios, Metropolitan of Laodicea, an Arab by birth, was elected only in April 1899.

One of the most distinguished chief pastors of the Orthodox East, the Most Blissful Meletios (1899–1906), was the first member of the Syrian hierarchy elected by a Council of Antioch hierarchs. This election was joyously

greeted by both clergy and laity of Syria, and his brief occupancy of the patriarchal throne is proclaimed to have been the beginning of a new historical era in Antioch, propitious to the awakening of the spiritual forces of the Arabs, the rise of educational movements among them, and their coming into close touch with the hierarchy on the basis of common ecclesiastical and national interests, problems and tendencies.

The activity of the Most Blissful Meletios was varied and fruitful. His successor was elected in the summer of 1906 in the person of Gregory IV, Metropolitan of Tripoli, who is the present Patriarch of Antioch and all the East, and whose apostolic service to the Syrian Church rivals that of his predecessor in spirit and power. The Most Blissful Gregory also is chiefly concerned with the religious and moral education of his Arabian people. He gives every encouragement and help to the Ecclesiastical Seminary of Belement, working for the establishment of an educated body of clegry. He has opened a number of successful schools in towns and villages, and set up a printing press which publishes books and pamphlets for the religious and moral education of the people; he has founded an official magazine of the Patriarchate, "Al Nimat," which also prints articles on various scientific subjects. The Most Blissful Gregory is ever ready to give his support to all educational enterprises, either of whole communities or of individuals wishing to found schools. He opposes the spread of alien religious propaganda by preaching in the churches and out of them, by the catechization of those who lack stability in the Orthodox Faith, and by the publication of suitable literature.

The Metropolitans of the Church are all of Arab birth, and are actively forwarding every enterprise of the Patriarch for the education of the people and the orderly regulation of affairs of the Church. In 1910 the Patriarch summoned a Council to Damascus for the examination of ecclesiastical questions of all kinds. The reformation of

monasteries, the restoration of churches, the organization of parishes, resistance to the spread of masonic and socialistic ideas, which had both penetrated into Syria with other ideals of Western Europe, the reestablishment of brotherly relations with other independent Churches, Eastern and Slavonic—these are some of the objects aimed at by the pastoral work of the Most Blissful Gregory, some of which have been partly realized already, or planned and only waiting for favourable conditions in the future. In 1913 the Patriarch Gregory went in person to Russia to congratulate the Emperor on the occasion of the tercentenary of the rule of the house of the Romanoffs and to establish firmer relations between Russia and Orthodox Syria. His journey had good results, reestablishing ecclesiastical relations between Russia and Syria.

III

The position, rights and duties of the Patriarch of Antioch have the following characteristics. He is the representative and chief hierarch of the Orthodox Church of Antioch, successor of the holy Apostles, St. Peter and St. Paul, founders of his Church, whose service in the land he continues. As representative of the Church and successor to the Apostles he is called "Most Blissful, most Divine and *most Holy*," in distinction to "all Holiest," the title belonging to the Patriarch of Constantinople. This title the Patriarch of Antioch enjoys in common with the Patriarchs of Alexandria and Jerusalem. He is also "Father of Fathers, Pastor of Pastors, Archbishop of Archbishops." This he owes to the past majesty and glory of the See of Antioch. At the end of the sixth century this Patriarchate consisted of twelve Metropolises with dependent Bishoprics, and five Metropolises without any dependent Bishoprics, altogether one hundred and fifty-one Bishops being dependent on the Patriarch of Antioch. It was as the head of so many spiritual fathers, pastors and bishops, that the Patriarch received the above title. As to the

title of "The Thirteenth Apostle," it refers to the missionary activity of the past—previous to the sixth century—when the Patriarch sent out preachers in Christ's name to all the East,—Persia, Armenia, Central Asia, India and China. The magnificent title of the Patriarch is at present of historical importance only, yet it is highly treasured and carefully preserved as witnessing to former greatness, as a living link with the past and as a sign of future regeneration, when the Church of Syria shall be as active, as prosperous and as successful as in the past.

At present the rights of the Antiochian Patriarch are of two kinds: purely ecclesiastical or spiritual, and civic and political.

As the chief Hierarch, the Patriarch is the spiritual father of all the Orthodox connected with the See, and the binding link between all the Antiochian Metropolitans on the one hand and the other autocephalous Churches of the East on the other. He is the defender of the Orthodox Faith in word and deed, everywhere and always, under every circumstance. The Patriarch has the prerogative of authority over all the Metropolitans, clergy and monks of the See. He presides over the Antiochian Holy Synod. He also has the supreme authority over all lay and ecclesiastical councils, *stavropigial* monasteries, churches, schools, charitable institutions, all the inalienable property destined for ecclesiastical purposes, and over all the communities to which the institutions belong.

The Patriarch in conjunction with the Holy Synod is responsible for the maintenance of the purity and integrity of the Orthodox dogma; for the preservation of the *Indiction,* that is, the Church calendar, which begins on September 1; for the proper observance of the canons and edicts of the Ecumenical Councils, and of local Church statutes, rites and orders; for the observance of the ancient rights of Christian communities and the maintenance of churches, schools and monasteries. It is the special duty of the Patriarch to look after the welfare of the Ecclesias-

tical Seminary founded in dependence on the monastery of Belement for the enlightened education of the clergy. Together with the Holy Synod it is the Patriarch's right to judge both clergy and laity in affairs of an ecclesiastical character, guided by the canons and edicts of the Church. The Patriarch provides for the enforcement of the resolutions of the Holy Synod and of the Mixed Council connected with the Patriarchate, as well as of its various clerical and secular institutions. He watches over the conduct of the clergy and ensures their compliance with all established statutes and rules.

The Christians of the Patriarchate must recognize the Patriarch as their spiritual father, and the lawful authority; they are bound to render him due honour and respect, and to obey his wise counsel in religious questions. Marriage and divorce are possible only by permission of the Patriarch, and the civic officials of Turkey have no right to interfere. The Patriarch punishes priests and bishops who overlook circumstances which make marriage unlawful.

Metropolitans, bishops, priors of monasteries, priests and monks are appointed or dismissed by the Patriarch alone and their lack of compliance with ecclesiastical rules is punished entirely as the Patriarch deems best, without any outside interference or guidance.

The Patriarch has the right to inherit, without any impediments whatsoever, the property of all deceased metropolitans, monks and hiero-monks, as well as legacies of all Orthodox laymen. The Patriarch is juridically invested with the right to judge the civil quarrels of his people, if the two sides agree to seek his judgment, also to make peace between them, take the oath of the opposing sides, and give orders for excommunication. The civil authorities of Turkey have no right to interfere with any such actions.

The Patriarch is elected for life and can be dethroned only in cases of political or canonical crimes. He can be

tried by a Church Council only, and his case can be examined in Constantinople alone. During divine service all the Metropolitans pray for him. It is his right to convoke a council of hierarchs, to write circular epistles to the people, to make new laws with the help of the Synod, to bless and consecrate Christians, to perform divine service according to patriarchal ordinance, and to maintain his patriarchal dignity everywhere and before everybody.

In addition to his ecclesiastical rights the Patriarch is also invested with certain civic powers. He represents his flock before the Turkish Government and is responsible for its loyal conduct.

As the supreme leader in all educational activity the Patriarch is also the protector and defender of schools, and of the men and women teachers. He draws up or accepts educational programmes, controls the diplomas of teachers, accepts or rejects school manuals, appoints and discharges teachers. The Turkish Government cannot interfere with any of these patriarchal prerogatives. Without communicating with the Patriarch the Turkish authorities have no juridical rights over priests or monks; they cannot arrest them nor compel the clergy to appear in the law courts of Turkey.

The Patriarch confirms the wills of deceased Christians, and no document is considered legal by the Turks without his confirmation. The Patriarch decides in the affairs of Christians all questions connected with the rights of inheritance, marriage, divorce, etc. Recording the property of deceased laymen, dividing it among the heirs, appointing wardens for minors or those defective in mind or body, guaranteeing their share of the inheritance, guarding the property of the absent, watching over wardens and executing the wills of deceased Christians—all these activities are part of the rights and privileges of the Patriarch of Antioch.

The Patriarch resides in Damascus, which is the centre of the Orthodox Patriarchate of Antioch. In this city the

Holy Synod meets, and the Orthodox Council, the Mixed Council and the Lay Commission or *Dimogerontia* of the patriarchal eparchy work here. In Damascus there live also the members of the patriarchal court, and the two titular bishops, one of whom is the *epitropos*, who in cases of need takes the place of the Patriarch. As to "Antioch, the great City of the Lord," in this little town, the number of whose inhabitants has dwindled to eight thousand, a special *epitropos* represents the Patriarch in its Orthodox parish. For the sake of the historical importance of Antioch its inhabitants have the privilege of taking part in the election of new Patriarchs. In conclusion it must be stated that enjoying *ipso jure* the many above-mentioned rights and *pronomia*, the Patriarch shares some of them with dependent Metropolitans, others with the Holy Synod or the Patriarchal and Mixed Councils, and that, by reason of such collaboration, he actually is able to be the true representative of the Church of Antioch and its flock.

IV

In view of the supreme position of the Patriarch of Antioch, there exists a special order for his election to the See, of which there is a detailed account in the Statute of the Orthodox Patriarchate of Antioch, which received its present form after the death of Patriarch Meletios. The election is conducted by the Mixed Council, presided over by the temporary occupant of the patriarchal throne, who is chosen from among the bishops of Antioch. In accordance with present conditions the electoral body is not numerous: there are ten lay and seventeen clerical members, of whom fourteen are Metropolitans representing all the eparchies of the Patriarchate, counting the temporary occupant, the patriarchal *epitropos* of Antioch, the patriarchal *epitropos* of Damascus and one priest of Damascus. Special injunctions of the Statute with regard

to the qualifications required in the candidate serve as a guide in the election. The Patriarch must be chosen from among the ruling Metropolitans of the Church, and must have been successful in his work in the eparchy entrusted to him. Further, he must be well instructed in theology and secular sciences. His personal life must be above reproach; his former activity must bear testimony to a punctilious observance of all the dogmas and teaching of the Orthodox Church, and he must be well able to defend the Holy Faith by word and deed under all conditions. Lastly, he must be a subject of the Ottoman Empire in the third generation on his father's side; he must enjoy the confidence of the Turkish government; he must be well acquainted with the laws of the land, and possess those qualities necessary to command the regard and respect of the people in the performance of the duties which the Supreme Court of the Sultan imposes upon him and to realize the *pronomia* conceded of old by the great Sultans of Turkey in regard to spiritual questions and the general administration of the Christian community within the boundaries of the Patriarchate of Antioch.

The electoral body holds three meetings, the most important of which is the third, when the Metropolitans alone go to the patriarchal Cathedral, and having prayed for the guidance of the Holy Spirit, hold a secret ballot for the election of one of the three candidates nominated at the second meeting. The Patriarch thus elected receives the *firman* of the Sultan, and begins to fulfil his exalted duties.

V

The Orthodox Church of Antioch is invested with an *autocephalous* dignity, that is, this Church is independent in its inner life, and is guided not only by the canons and laws common to all the Eastern Churches, but also by edicts of local origin, and submits in all details of order and

government to the independent authority of its Patriarch, who is its representative and first hierarch. Yet for all his rights and *pronomia* the Patriarch of Antioch does not govern his Patriarchate alone, but with the collaboration of institutions and individual officials. The chief among the administrative juridical institutions in the Church of Antioch is the Holy Synod. The Holy Synod of the Church of Antioch consists of all the eparchial Metropolitans and is called every three years at the beginning of May to a place indicated by the Patriarch. If necessary it can also be assembled at other times, but only by the special invitation of the Patriarch. If a Metropolitan has legitimate grounds for absenting himself from the synodal sessions, he must formally delegate another hierarch in his stead. If two thirds of the members of the Synod request the Patriarch to call an extraordinary meeting, giving sufficiently important reasons, the Patriarch must agree.

The duties of the Holy Synod consist in the examination of the report of the Patriarchal Council for the previous three years; in discussing and passing resolutions regarding questions of faith, preaching, schools, the distribution of suitable literature among the people, and the confirmation of carefully studied resolutions on administrative and juridical questions sent to the Holy Synod by the two inferior institutions, the Patriarchal Council and the Mixed Council, as well as by the eparchial administrative and juridical institutions.

The Holy Synod is guided by the Church canons and statutes in its decisions and resolutions. One of the clergy is appointed by the Patriarch as secretary to the Synod. This secretary is responsible for the safety of all documents held for examination, he records resolutions, draws up protocols, keeps all the official books, and is in fact in charge of the Synodal clerical department, preserving profound secrecy with regard to all its affairs.

VI

The order and activity of the Holy Synod of Antioch, as above described, makes necessary the existence of another institution destined to aid the Patriarch and the Synod in the central church government and in the enforcement of the law. This auxiliary institution is the Orthodox Patriarchal Council, which is intended to take part in the supreme government of the Antiochian Church. The Council is composed of five members, two of whom are of the number of the ruling Metropolitans of the Church, two others are appointed from among the number of the titulary bishops and one is an archimandrite or a priest. *Ipso jure* the Patriarch is the president of this Council, the duties devolving in his absence on the Metropolitan whose chirotony is of the longest standing. The members of the Council are all appointed by the Patriarch, each being invited by him by a special letter. The ruling Metropolitans observe their turns strictly, exceptions being made only in cases of sickness or advanced age. The Metropolitans are called to the Patriarchal Council in order; the eparchies are distributed as follows:

1. Diarbekir and Acre
2. Khama and Aleppo
3. Tripoli and Latakia
4. Beirut and Zahle
5. Homs and Mercina
6. Jebeil, Tyre and Sidon
7. Erzerum and Hauran

The Patriarchal Council assembles yearly on May 1, and sits for three months, but its duration can be extended to six months if necessary.

The duties of the Patriarchal Council consist in examining all the juridical and administrational questions of the eparchy of Damascus and of the Patriarchate in general, and in preparing resolutions concerning them, in caring for the welfare of the patriarchal or *stavropigial* monasteries and in controlling their household expenditure, in providing for the education of the people by means of

preaching, schools, the publication of suitable literature, etc., also in safeguarding the purity of the Orthodox faith of the masses, examining cases of marriage and divorce in the light of the canons of the Church, and in seeing that the resolutions of the Holy Synod are duly carried out after the cases have been presented to the Council by the Patriarch himself. If at the end of the sessions of the Council the Patriarch is unable to decide alone on any case submitted to him, he may appoint two Metropolitans as a Council to aid him in arriving at a decision.

At the end of every year the Patriarchal Council prepares its report, which is submitted with all necessary documents to the Holy Synod when the latter is called. The administrative and juridical work of the Patriarchal Council covers the whole Patriarchate. In ordinary times it seems to take the place of the Synod, which in Antioch meets periodically only, having developed on rather unusual lines.

VII

There also exists in the Patriarchate a Mixed Council. This is composed of a president and four members, two of whom are ecclesiastics and two laymen. By force of his position the Patriarch is president of this Council, but he empowers his *epitropos* to perform the presidential duties. By a special order the Patriarch appoints two members of his own Council to work with the Mixed Council. The two laymen of the Mixed Council are chosen from among the inhabitants of Damascus by a special committee of ecclesiastics and laymen, whose assembly is the so-called *dimogerontia* of that city. It works under the presidency of the bishop representing the Patriarch, electing the members for one year by a majority of votes. At the end of this period they may, however, be re-elected. The laymen receive no remuneration for their work in the Council.

The duties of the Mixed Council are to examine and

settle all disputes regarding property in connection with marriage and divorce, to decide all questions of disputed wills and of rights of inheritance. For the Orthodox of the eparchy the Mixed Council is the first legal resort. It also examines cases sent to the Patriarch from other eparchies, if the decision of the local council had been appealed. In such cases the Mixed Council is the second legal resort. The Mixed Council is guided by the Six Books of Armenopulo, by the *Vasiliks*, *Novellos* and the patriarchal and local law manuals.

VIII

There exists in the Antiochian Patriarchate a separate Clerical Law Court. The Patriarch is, by right of his position, its president, but generally appoints his *epitropos*, or *protocynkelos*, or some other cleric in his stead. In addition to its president the Clerical Court has four members appointed by the Patriarch from the number of the priests of Damascus. These work for a term of two years or more, receiving no remuneration for their services. The Clerical Court has its own secretary.

All cases connected with marriage, engagement and the family come within the jurisdiction of this court: such as, the legality of an engagement or marriage, separation of husband and wife, resumption of marital relations, marriage contracted secretly or without the parental consent, recognition of illegitimate children, etc.. The material side of all these matters is under the supervision of the Mixed Council, the Clerical Court being concerned with them only from an ecclesiastical or canonical point of view, in as far as they deflect from the rules and edicts of the Church. The Clerical Court is guided by the *Nomocanon*, and the rules established by the Patriarchs and the Holy Synod of the Church of Antioch.

Clergy who transgress the canons of their Church are not judged by the Clerical Court, but by the Orthodox Patriarchal Council or the Holy Synod. The Holy

Synod alone is authorized to remove clergy from office in any eparchy of the Patriarch of Antioch.

IX

In the past the officials of the Patriarchal Councils helping the Patriarch in his labours were very numerous. Now that his flock is reduced in numbers and the work simplified, their number is much smaller. At present there are:

1. The Patriarchal *Epitropos* in Damascus, usually chosen from among the Metropolitans *emeriti* of the See. Antioch, the former patriarchal residence, also has its *epitropos* in the person of the archimandrite, who is the dean of the local community. Temporary patriarchal representatives are also appointed in dioceses which for some valid reason remain vacant during a period of longer or shorter duration.

2. The *Protocynkelos* is the right hand of the Patriarch in all his administrative work. He is his vicar and takes the place of the Patriarch in all celebrations, divine services, etc.. He is also a member of various institutions, of the Patriarchal Council, the Mixed Council, etc..

3. The *Archdeacon* is the second assistant of the Patriarch who on some occasions takes the place of the *protocynkelos*.

4. The *Exarch* is an honorary title bestowed by the Patriarch on some parochial priest for irreproachable conduct or some special services to the eparchy.

5. The *Economos*, also an honorary title bestowed by the Patriarch on certain parochial priests.

X

At the end of the sixth century there were one hundred and fifty-one eparchies of varying importance in the Church of Antioch. At present their number is but fifteen, counting the eparchy of the Patriarch himself,

XI

In the Church of Antioch Metropolitans are elected by the Patriarch and the other ruling Metropolitans, but the clergy and laity of the vacant See have a share in the election. By invitation of the Patriarch the latter are allowed forty days to nominate three candidates, whose names are then forwarded to the Patriarch for his consideration.

Within their eparchies the Metropolitans enjoy all the rights and fulfil all the duties allotted to them by the Church canon and the supreme *firman* or *berat* of the Sultan, confirming all the ecclesiastical and social privileges of the hierarchs of Syria. In other words, the Metropolitan has in his eparchy the administrative and juridical duties analogous to those of the Patriarch in his own eparchy.

Metropolitan government in the Church of Antioch is simple, for neither the clergy nor their charges are large in number. The Metropolitan is the spiritual chief of his district, and is invested with his rights and prerogatives by the Patriarch and the Holy Synod of the Church of Antioch. He is the head of the administration, and the judge of all his people and his clergy. Without the consent and goodwill of the Metropolitan nothing can be done in the administration of the eparchy. The Metropolitan is also the head of the auxiliary institutions in his eparchy, which exist to help him, as it would be impossible for him if he worked alone to attend to all the different requirements of his eparchy. The Metropolitan appoints and dismisses all the officials assisting him or employed in the auxiliary institutions. But neither officials nor institutions are numerous in the eparchies of the Antiochian Church.

1. In every eparchy there exists a Clerical Court of Law instituted to deal with engagements, marriages and other family matters from the canonical point of view.

The president of the Court is the Metropolitan. Its members (three or four priests) are appointed by him, generally for a term of two years. The duties and privileges of the Clerical Court in a metropolis are analogous to those of the Patriarchal Court.

2. The metropolises have also a Mixed Council whose president is the Metropolitan and whose members are twelve laymen elected for a period of two years in the city in which the Metropolitan resides. This Mixed Council, similar to that in the patriarchal eparchy, deals with all matters relating to the Church community. It is an advisory body and an auxiliary institution to aid the Metropolitan in his administrative activity. The Mixed Council watches over the schools and charitable institutions, organizes, provides funds, receives and issues reports, takes charge of the eparchial property, upholds the Metropolitan in his intercourse with the Turkish government, safeguarding the rights and privileges of the people, helps him in the introduction of new state laws among the masses and in the even distribution of the state taxation, etc. The same statutes apply to the activity of the Mixed Council in the Patriarchate and in the metropolises. They are similar in their aims and in their work. But on the other hand, for the Orthodox population it stands in the light of a *dimogerontia*.

The officials working under the bishops are as follows: (a) A *Protocynkelos*, the first assistant of the Metropolitan, his vicar or *epitropos*, representing him at celebrations, in dealings with authorities, etc.. (b) An *Archdeacon*, the other intimate assistant of the Metropolitan, holding services with him, travelling with him, etc.. (c) An *Economos*, an honorary title for priests who distinguish themselves above the average by their services or qualities. In some cases a Metropolitan may have a *protocynkelos* but no archdeacon, or *vice versa*, in rare cases both are replaced by: (d) A *Deacon*, who is the only clerical assistant of a Metropolitan, his secretary, his

travelling companion, etc., attending to the duties of both of the above-mentioned.

The administration of the Church, that is, appointment and discharge of priests, supervision of their work and conduct, etc., is the duty of the Metropolitans, assisted by any of the three above-named officials. But the juridical activity of the Church and its administrative activity are strictly separate. The Clerical Court of Law therefore stands out prominently.

XII

The eparchies of the Antiochian Patriarchate have no common order, but adapt their rule and jurisdiction to local needs. Similarly, the parishes of the eparchies are not governed according to any precise statutes, but traditions, customs and the ancient order of things as preserved among the parishioners hold their sway.

The parish groups itself around its church, which is generally kept up by the parishioners. The Orthodox churches of Syria are neither prosperous nor imposing, indeed such is the poverty of these little groups that the most necessary things, such as holy images (icons), vestments, vessels, etc., are wanting. Many a hamlet or even village has still no church of its own, and the problem of the erection of church buildings is far from a satisfactory solution. Many poorly supported, inadequately decorated churches bear witness to the extreme destitution of their parishes. The same may be said of the schools. The parishes grouped around churches certainly show tendencies to found schools, but because of extreme poverty and the insufficient inner vitality of the parishes many villages in Syria to this day have no schools of their own. In the parishes of towns and big villages representatives are chosen to form a local committee of wardens to care for the material possessions of the church and school. The same wardens collect small sums from Orthodox families for the benefit of the priest. But in these matters organ-

ization is far from being perfect. In towns only are the parishes compact living communities, in villages even today they lack definite life. As to the parochial clergy of Syria, they are represented by priests and deacons, the latter in cities. Church readers do not exist, their duties being performed either by priests if there be more than one, or by pious parishioners, or even by the pupils of primary schools. In Syria it is only the priests of the cities who have any education approaching to that of the clergy of other lands. In the country the education of the clergy is extremely deficient. Most of these priests receive such instruction as they can obtain in an elementary school, and after ordination continue the life they had led before in the midst of the congregation as one of it, still carrying on their agricultural and industrial pursuits. Yet as to morals the parish clergy of Syria are above reproach; the parishioners too are very observant and exacting, never accepting a priest of doubtful morality.

The nomination of priests to their parishes depends, needless to say, on the bishop of the eparchy. But in the course of time it has become customary for a parish to elect its own candidate. Having agreed on one the parishioners beg the Metropolitan to ordain him priest. He is generally one of the villagers who is able to read and to write, is acquainted with the Church statutes, is a man of pure life, respected by the rest of the parish for his moral qualities. Naturally such a nomination is not binding on the Metropolitan. But in Syria there are so few suitable candidates for the priesthood that bishops are generally willing to satisfy the desires of the parish, if on their part they think the candidate worthy. Of course any appointments made by the Metropolitan independently remain in force. This is especially the case in cities where greater educational demands are made on the priests. In the majority of cases the priests belong to the married clergy, especially those in the villages.

The parish clergy are often supported by small fees for the administration of the sacraments, from ten to forty cents for marriages, baptisms, burials, etc., and by small collections made in the churches during divine service. Only in the towns do they receive a regular salary, amounting to from twenty to eighty francs monthly, to which every family contributes its apportionment. But on the whole the clergy of Syria live in destitution, and suffer under the misery of material conditions. Many a priest, especially in the villages, where there may be several owing to the dissensions of the various factions, is reduced to practising some trade he learned before taking holy orders, or to cultivating field and garden, cutting wood in the forests and carrying it home. Those among them who are more or less literate do copying. In the villages the priests sometimes receive from their parishioners wool, oil, wheat, flour in their seasons. In Hauran the priests do not appear to differ from their flock in dress or in occupation. The wooden cross, which is the token of the priestly calling and power, is carefully hidden under the shirt. In the metropolises of Acre, Latakia, Tripoli, Emes and others, the custom exists of the priesthood passing down from one generation to another in the same family—from father to the eldest son, who can transmit it to his brothers if he should have no sons of his own. In such priestly families this at times leads to quarrels which may spread among the parishioners and impede the normal activity of the parish.

The education of parochial clergy is deficient, their material outlook uncertain, and it is no wonder that they do not prove as efficient among their flocks as they should be. Preaching is entirely out of question, the members of a parish can be taught alone by the example of the moral life which the priest leads.

In some of the eparchies charitable institutions are doing good work. For instance, in Tripoli there are eleven philanthropical societies, eight with male membership and

three to which women are admitted. Each of these works within a set district of Tripoli or its seaport El-Minah, caring for poor school children. One society in El-Minah devotes itself to the burial of the poor. The same society also exists among others in Emes. In Damascus a women's association supports a free hospital dedicated to St. Panteleimon.

The masses in distant parishes are still truly inspired with a love for the Orthodox Church and the faith of their fathers. They observe fast days, and other institutions of the Church; they honour the superior ecclesiastical authorities and the clergy. In many the ancient moral code of their fathers has been preserved in its purity. But the lack of education leads to the pursuit of superficial success and material gains, and inability to resist the propaganda of alien creeds, partisanship and enmity threaten to betray the Orthodox Faith where personal and party gains are concerned.

In the Church of Antioch the parish is waiting for regeneration and re-organization. For a long time the parochial clergy have been conscious of their abnormal position and persistently demand the necessary improvements. The people are dissatisfied with their uneducated clergy, seeking in the person of a priest an enlightened guide in religious and social life. In many eparchies the initiative of local Metropolitans has produced numerous changes beneficial in the relations between priest and parishioner, and infused vitality into the various parochial activities. The Orthodox population has now reached the turning point in the life of its Church, which has been hastened by the re-establishment of the native Arab hierarchy with the Most Blissful Patriarch Gregory IV at its head. Time will justify the hopes and expectations of the people.

XIII

The Ecclesiastical Seminary of Belement in the monastery of the Assumption of the Holy Virgin, now stands at

the head of all the schools of Syria. The Seminary was founded in 1900 in the vicinity of Tripoli by the Most Blissful Meletios, with the object of training clergy for the Church of Antioch. It is supported by the funds of the Belement monastery and donations from the Patriarchate. At first the course of study was to last six years. Apologetical and moral dogmatics were to be studied, as well as commentaries on the Holy Scriptures, ecclesiastical history, patrology, ecclesiastical law, general history, psychology, logic, mathematics, geography, and the Arab, Greek, Russian and French languages, etc.. It was intended that there should be about forty pupils, who should attend morning and evening prayer with the monks of the monastery, take turns in participating in divine service on festivals, do penance, go to confession, take the Holy Communion four times a year, dress like monks, eat with them, and comply with all the demands of the monastic rule. After six years the students were to be ordained deacons or even priests. But those who did not take holy orders received no attestation of having gone through the course. Pupils came from all the metropolises of the Patriarchate, after having taken an examination at a primary school on reaching the age of fifteen years. The teachers on the faculty were both clerical and secular, some of them highly educated.

The period of instruction has now been shortened and the course considerably modified. The Russian language has nevertheless been retained. At the Council of Damascus in 1910 a discussion took place on the subject of the removal of the Seminary from Belement to Beirut, and the restoration of the original programme. But the school is still awaiting these improvements. In the meantime the graduates are passed on to the Theological Seminary on the Isle of Halka, near Constantinople, or to the seminaries of Russia to complete their studies.

The other important school of Syria is the gymnasium

at Homs, founded in 1910 by Athanasius, Metropolitan of Emes, and still supervised by him. There are seven classes in this gymnasium, the subjects studied being: religion, history, philosophy, logic, mathematics, natural sciences, the Arabian, Turkish, French and English languages, geography, book-keeping, etc.. English may be considered the official language of the school, being used for all subjects except religion and some others for beginners. The gymnasium prepares its pupils for higher education; but those who are unable to continue studying learn a good deal at the gymnasium in a practical way, especially of foreign languages, which are so indispensable in the East. Pupils come from all parts of Syria, the non-Orthodox even seeking admission. The students number about two hundred. This gymnasium is proving its utility and has a great future before it. The Metropolitan Athanasius, to whose energy and learning the school owes its existence, intended to have the Russian language taught in the future.

In 1911 Paul, Metropolitan of Lebanon, also founded a gymnasium for boys in the monastery of St. John the Baptist. It has five classes with a course providing a good general education. It prepares its pupils for foreign colleges in Beirut, the American university, and the Latin College of St. Joseph. But the gymnasium is intended for the children of Orthodox parents of the eparchy of Lebanon. The atmosphere of the school is strictly ecclesiastical.

Besides these, Beirut possesses the "Al-Salam" (the School of Peace), founded by the Metropolitan Hieracimos; a girls' boarding school supported by a Ladies' Philanthropical Society called "The Flower of Charity"; a girls' asylum in Homs founded by the local Orthodox Brotherhood; the school of the blind Arabian poet Mukdisi Khan, in the village of Amium near Tripoli; the school of Patriarch Gregory IV in Antioch; the Orthodox boarding school "Mudrasat-al-Bustan" in one of the

villages on Mount Lebanon, and a few others founded by the Patriarch, the Metropolitans and some private persons.

Still the number of schools in the Patriarchate of Antioch is very insufficient; they are very poorly supplied with books and other school requisites; the teachers lack proper training. Altogether they are not in a position to satisfy the demands made today by the Orthodox population of Syria. But besides the schools which owe their existence to native effort, the Patriarch permits foreign schools, French, American, English, Italian and others, all of which serve educational purposes in Arabia, but at the same time serve for the foreign religious and political propaganda of Western Europe.

In 1895 by request of the Patriarch Spiridonios and the Metropolitans of Beirut, Tyre and Sidon, Tripoli, and Emes, the Imperial Orthodox Palestine Society of Russia entered the educational arena of Syria. It struck deep root and became an inseparable part of the native official and private effort and achievement of educational enterprise in Syria. At present it is a powerful factor for the good of the people. It has won the praises and grateful blessings of all native builders of true national prosperity as the most beneficial educational power. With the help of the Palestine Society the young people of Syria are instructed without running the risk of estrangement from their own people and Church, and so are preserved from anti-national religious and educational influences, while on the other hand they acquire powers and means for independent activity in accordance with home traditions and ideals and a truly national spirit. At present the Palestine Society has twenty-seven schools in Northern Syria, forty-five in the South, and five in Beirut, all of them primary schools, in which 9,000 native children are taught. The activity of the Palestine Society also extends to the building of churches and the giving of material help to the Syrians. It has won universal

regard and the touching gratitude of the Patriarch, the Metropolitans, clergy and the people generally.

In 1909 Gregory IV founded a journal which is published in Arabic under the title of "Al-Nimat" (Grace). The Patriarchate supplies the funds for this undertaking. It appears every fortnight, and is sold abroad at the price of fifteen francs. Its programme is rather broad, for it publishes theological and historical articles, also articles on pedagogical and scientific subjects in a general way; it gives news of the Orthodox Church in Syria and other countries; and produces the works of ancient Arabic writers whose manuscripts have been preserved, etc.. It is the first official Church publication in Arabic. It is printed in the patriarchal printing press founded by the Most Blissful Gregory IV, and is extremely useful.

As to theological science, so far it does not exist in the Church of Antioch. Neither are there any higher Orthodox schools. Almost everything that exists today in Arabic on theological subjects has been translated from the Greek or the Russian. The national forces of this region are only just beginning to show signs of development. They have so far found expression to some extent in various educational societies (The Hope of the Fatherland, The Flower of Orthodoxy, etc.), which supported some educational enterprises, and in the publication of a few journals and papers. This spiritual awakening of the land owes a good deal to the Arabs who, having emigrated to America, do not forget their own home land and are always ready to give material help in all educational enterprises in distant Syria.

XIV

The monasteries of the Church of Antioch in Syria are of two kinds: the *stavropigial*, those under the direct control of the Patriarch, and the eparchial, which are dependent on the local Metropolitans.

The *stavropigial* monasteries are: the St. George's,

called Humaira, which owns arable land, vineyards and gardens; the monastery of the Assumption of the Holy Virgin, near Tripoli which is called Belement, at present the home of the Ecclesiastical Seminary; St. Elijah's near Beirut, which is small and poor and is at present owned by some Russian monks; the Sednai nunnery dedicated to the Birth of the Holy Virgin, situated to the north of Damascus, on a vertical rock, and built according to tradition by the Emperor Justinian in 546, and supported by the revenues of its own lands and donations. The nuns come to this convent from all parts of Syria, their number now amounting to forty-five. There is also another monastery in the name of St. Thekla, situated four hours from Sednai, which is supported by its own revenues. As to the eparchial monasteries, there are some in the metropolises of Lebanon, Seleukia, Acre, etc., but not in all the eparchies.

Even when compared with their condition in the recent past—some twenty-five years ago—the monasteries of Antioch must be acknowledged to be in a state of decline. In accordance with a statute they used to be self-supporting, owning much landed property which they cultivated most successfully, and attracting pilgrims from Syria and Palestine. Now few of them contain many monks, being for the most part inhabited by a prior and his assistant. The property is not well cultivated, and so brings in but poor returns. The material prosperity of the monasteries having declined, the houses of archbishops, the schools and charitable institutions which they maintained have also become destitute.

Attention is much needed in the training of monks, that they may be well-educated and devoted to the interests of the Orthodox Faith, and also able to care for their property and so increase their revenues. In the summer of 1913 the Council of the Hierarchs of the Antiochian Church discussed the advisability of founding a special monastic order among the Syrian monks, in the hands of

which should be placed both the *stavropigial* and the eparchial monasteries. But the question was not definitely settled. In the meantime the conditions of the monasteries remain as unsatisfactory as before.

XV

It is not easy to make an estimate of the number of Orthodox inhabitants in Syria, partly owing to the lack of reliable statistical data throughout the Turkish Empire and also to the increased number of emigrants from Syria to America. According to information received from the Most Blissful Gregory IV the number of Orthodox in his Patriarchate in 1913 amounted to 400,000. These are almost exclusively Arabs, with only a small percentage of Greeks.

In conclusion we must say that the spiritual regeneration of the Church of Antioch, begun under the influence of the native hierarchy, has been brought to a standstill by the horrors and calamities of the world war. It is, however, the general conviction that the Orthodox Faith, which since the remotest past has beautified the people of Syria, will once more be their salvation in the critical conditions imposed on them by the Turks and the Teutons.

May liberty once more rule outwardly and inwardly in the most ancient Orthodox Church of Antioch.

Resurrection

By William Porcher DuBose, M.A., S.T.D.

The first and deepest note of Christianity has been struck in the one term Incarnation. The perfection of meaning and reality contained in that word has been a matter of gradual and perpetual revelation: God eternally For us, To us, With us, In us—until all connecting particle disappears in the consummated oneness of God and us in Christ. I have wondered whether that is not St. Paul's mind in the unexplained passage Gal. 3:20. The Law was given through the mediation of Angels and of Moses. Now mediation is "between two," it is not "of one"; but God and man in Christ is one. It is true that in this union God is All or All in All, so that man in a sense disappears and "God is One." So even of Christ Himself it is said, that when He shall have put all things under His feet—"then shall the Son Himself be subjected to Him that did subject all things to Him, that God may be all in all." But that God should be All in All in the Unity of All does not efface either the Son or man but only "finds" and exalts them. "Our wills (or selves) are ours, we know not how: they are ours to make them Thine": but when we shall have made our wills God's through His making His ours—*our* very making them so along with His perpetuates us in the all embracing unity of Him.

Incarnation then is the first and most essential note, but Resurrection is the next: and this is as essential in effect as that was as cause. Resurrection is the expression, and the only adequate expression, of the work of Incarnation. Redemption or Salvation are empty terms

in comparison; they state the form of a process without giving its substance. Redemption from what? Salvation to what? The answer is, From death unto life—and that is Resurrection. Now in the study of Resurrection, as in that of Incarnation, we are blinded to the truth of the Self-demonstrating Spirit by the apparent contradictions of the physical or material letter. We have to do with a matter which is obliged to be true in the Spirit, and cannot be true in the letter; and yet—so far as we can see—to be true at all, must be true in both.

At present I go only so far as this: The truth of the Spirit may help us to solve the difficulties of the letter; stopping upon the problem of the letter will keep us there forever, not only in doubt but in positive disbelief. We have no right, because we have no honest possibility, of belief in the material accounts of our Lord's Birth and Resurrection, solely upon the plane of the physical and the natural. And yet much so-called faith, or religious assent, and even zeal and activity, rests upon no better basis than the avowed physical and material facts. I do not say, do not believe these, but I do say that a faith that rests only on these is not faith at all, but only belief, —if not indeed only credulity.

The foundation upon which Christianity rests is—on the plane of natural probability—the most incredible and impossible event in human history. It is at the same time one of the best attested: No one can get into the mind of the New Testament without being convinced of the quality as well at the quantity of the evidence for the truth of the Risen Lord of Life. St. Paul and the more than five hundred who had seen Him—the greater part of whom were still alive when the Apostle wrote—are witnesses hard to gainsay. Then Christianity itself—the fact that that incredible event of the Resurrection has also been the most potent, influential, determinative factor in human history and civilization

—tells for a great deal: that it has actually given name to the entire era of real history. But the mere testimony of the New Testament and the Christian Church is not our most convincing proof of the Resurrection of Jesus Christ: it is not that that makes us believe it against the unanswerable objections of our most indubitable natural science. The only invincible evidence of the Truth is its own truth: the more we penetrate into the truth of the Resurrection the more we know that it is true. On the contrary, the more we linger among the mere details of the letter of the account of the Resurrection the more we make it impossible to believe it. Even yet we are incredibly far from comprehending or interpreting the full meaning of the Resurrection—and so of the Redemption or Salvation wrought by it. This is no mere fault-finding or depreciation of the Christianity we have got. There is a vast deal of implicit faith in the world whose roots penetrate much more deeply into the Fact of the Resurrection than any of our explicit interpretations or definitions have reached.

Again then I say: Let us look away from the mere natural or contra-natural details of the Resurrection—away from the mere visible to the *not*-invisible features of it, though only spiritual eyes can see them. I will take the Church's Easter Preface for our text:—"But chiefly are we bound to praise Thee for the glorious Resurrection of Thy Son Jesus Christ our Lord: for He is the very Paschal Lamb which was offered for us, and hath taken away the sin of the world: Who by His death hath destroyed death, and by His rising to life again hath restored to us everlasting life. Therefore, etc.."

It is remarkable with regard to the simple and beautiful accounts or records that give us what I have called the "letter" of the Birth and the Resurrection of Jesus,—how delicately and exactly they are also true to the spiritual depth and significance of these events: This Child to be born is "Immanuel—God with us"; His Name shall be

called Jesus, for "It is He that shall save His people from their sins." St. Mark, who is much less explicit—or rather, does not give the physical birth at all—nevertheless designates Jesus Son of God in the caption of his Gospel and, through John the Baptist, identifies Him with the Remitter of Sin and the Baptizer with the Holy Ghost. I need not dwell upon the wonderful and infallible spiritual instinct and felicity with which St. Luke handles every minutest physical detail of the Birth. St. John gives the Baptist's own impression and interpretation of the Baptism of Jesus and is himself already reached by the fundamental truth expressed in the words: "Behold the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world." In fact when I most wish to divest my mind of the Natural (wherein are the difficulties) and fix it upon the Spiritual that satisfies and convinces me, I find that I get at it best through those very little stories told in terms of the natural, but so breathing all the air and life of the highest and purest spiritual: I don't object to a letter that so utters and expresses the Spirit.

Going then as straight as possible to the gist of the Resurrection, we see that that consists in a doing away with death through the taking away of sin. Now, taking it literally, death has not been done away, and will not be so long as our present nature continues and living beings terminate their existence in it: it certainly is not in that sense that death is done away. Neither is it done away in the sense of the mere fact of the continuance after it of our present natural life in any other form, however supernatural. Christian resurrection, as also a redemption and a salvation, consists exactly in this: It is a removal from life, or an extinction in life, of all that hinders it as life, or that tends to make it not "life." But the extinction of all in life that contradicts or destroys it is equally the extinction of all in death that makes it death in its present "fallen" meaning. What is it then that poisons life and makes even death the evil it now is

—in fact, altogether constitutes, and wholly is, death in all its bad sense?

"Then saith He, 'Lo I come to do Thy will, O Lord!'" So the Messiah is represented as proclaiming His Mission. And certainly the key-note of our Lord's life is, "I am come to do the will of Him that sent me": that was His meat and drink. He claims at last to have glorified God, in that "I have accomplished the work Thou gavest me to do." Now what was that will and work of God, for which our Lord came and lived and died? "Lo, I come to do Thy will, O God!"—"By the which will," explains the inspired writer, "we are sanctified." "This is the will of God—even your sanctification," St. Paul impresses upon his disciples. "Be ye holy, for I am holy,"—were God's own words of old—and so our Lord, "For their sakes I sanctify myself, that they also may be sanctified in truth." "Father," He pleads, "sanctify them in the truth; Thy word is Truth." And He Himself was that word and that Truth Incarnate.

To know further what our Lord is, we must enquire further what truth is—the truth that is sanctification, and the sanctification that is life. We must begin with distinguishing truth from merely the actual, "that which is." The truth of any form of life, even a plant, is not whatever it happens to be, but what it ought to be, and must be, in order to be itself. If an insect or any external agency should inject poison or introduce damage of any sort into the plant, producing perversion or deformity,—no one would call that the truth, however it might be the fact or the actual condition of the plant. Now if the plant could—or any higher form or reach of life should—include in itself the thing we know as consciousness of self, and the yet higher power of self-determination or formal freedom,—and so the self-perversion or deformity which is its actual state or condition should be the result of its own will and act,—that would be, and is, what we call sin. That one word covers all that will impede, con-

tradict, impair, or destroy life or that constitutes death —in the bad sense in which it needs to be abolished. All else is in God's hands, and nothing that is not ourself need or will defeat that being or becoming ourself which is our whole and our only truth. When I speak of becoming and being ourself—of course I mean that of which the other side and the necessary condition is the being in full correspondence with one's environment, which means in perfect relation with all the Notoneself.

Now how did, and does, Christ so take away sin as to destroy death and so perfect life? In order to so take it away, He must (in a sense not to be misunderstood, and if possible to be understood) have "taken sin": and that is what the word and the language of Scripture mean. He must have taken and occupied our place—which means our own actual and full relation to sin: not in our relation to it in obeying it, but in our complete relation to it *except* obeying it. It is in this sense that God "made Him to be sin for us, Who knew no sin, that we might be made the righteousness of God in Him." Christ in our flesh, by taking its sin in so far as sin was—not the truth, but the actual state and condition, of the flesh He assumed,—and by then, under the state and condition, *not* sinning, broke the power and reign of sin over the flesh, and abolished death in its prior sense: the sting of death, the *death* in death, is sin. So again,—"God, sending His Son in the likeness of sinful flesh (or the flesh of sin) and for sin, condemned (or destroyed) sin in the flesh." But before undertaking to explain these extreme texts—let us determine in what sense our Lord "took sin,"—or what was His human relation to sin prior and in order to His breaking its power, and so condemning, and ultimately abolishing and destroying it.

To say that "the flesh," or our human organism, or that "the world" of our humanity is evil,—describes their actual state or condition, but it does not describe their proper nature. It is true to reason and to deepest fact

to say that God in the act of creation "saw that they were good." Apart from sin there is no evil: "there is nothing evil but the evil will"—just as "there is nothing good but the good will." If there were no creature or finite "free" will in the world—which means "good *or* evil" will—there would be no such thing as good or evil at all in the world: such moral distinction would not exist. But evil must be possible in order that good may be possible over against it, and so there may be choice and freedom and personality, and so oneness with and likeness to God. At any rate *so it is*, and so alone we could be what we are —rational, free, moral, and spiritual *persons*.

And again—*So it is* that the actual state or condition of our flesh and so of our world is not what it ought to be—what it properly or essentially *is*—good; but it is what *we* have actually made it—and that is evil and hopelessly in subjection to evil. Now when our Lord entered into our flesh and into our world, He entered into them as they are—needing redemption, salvation, resurrection, and for the purpose of being all these in them and for them and to them. In the flesh and in the world He does not judge or condemn or damn them for the fact or actuality of sin. That, as we shall see, had been inevitable; all He ever condemns man for is—*not* being sinners, not knowing that they were sinners, needing and wanting and willing to be saved from their sin. Our Lord had no mission or message or meaning for any but sinners: He turns the very fact and sense and emptiness and poverty, and helplessness and evil and curse of sin into the most potent instrument and argument of divine Love and Grace and Fellowship and Salvation. He makes God one with them as they are in order that He may make them one with God as He is.

The one most essential and emphatic point of Christianity is that it has no condemnation for the universal and inevitable fact of sin. All its judgment and penalty is for those who will not know their sin, whose very sin

itself does not drive them to their only deliverance from it. Indeed what we, anthropomorphically, call and look upon as the wrath of God, is something which no one feels against us or inflicts upon us but ourselves. To say, "The soul that sinneth it shall die"—is only warning us of a fact: sin is death, and the only death. God gives us life, which spiritually is as identical with holiness as physically it is with health. He gives us (in Christ) Himself—all His Love, His Grace, His Fellowship—to be our life as it is His own. If that is life, then to be without it—certainly to reject it—is in itself death; and it is a death that none but ourselves can inflict upon us. How, or when, or where this self-inflicted wrath of God shall be visited—and upon whom—I know not. I only know that if holiness is life, sin of itself is death—if one is Heaven, the other in itself is Hell. And it is of this holiness that our Lord speaks: "Thou hast given me power over all flesh—that whomsoever Thou givest me, I shall give to them eternal life." "For their sakes I sanctify myself, that they themselves also may be sanctified in truth."

The chief question yet remains: How may we venture to say that Jesus Christ was under sin, and how did He condemn and abolish it?—And that, not only for Himself but for us? To begin with, Christ in our humanity—considered merely as nature, that is to say, in itself—was as impotent and helpless for holiness, righteousness, and eternal life as we are. When He took our nature He took it with all its natural deficiencies: when He was "born under the law," that law which is none other than God's own, and God's Self, was as impossible for Him as for us. When *Himself* became human, He was as little able "of Himself" to be all His—even human—self as any and every man is. There is nothing of Himself that our Lord so emphasizes as His own utter impotence, "of Himself." "Of myself I can do nothing." Nothing less than the sense and the reality of His utter and absolute

oneness with the Father sufficed to enable Him to be Himself. It was in fact this all-essential and necessary dependence upon God as Father that He came to realize for us, to manifest in his own person, to impart to us all. I know nothing of myself, I speak nothing of myself, I am nothing of myself. But I know God, I speak directly from God, and to you I am God. He that heareth me heareth the Father, and he that seeth me seeth the Father. The Word of God *is* God, and the Spirit of God is God. And nowhere else or otherwise has God so revealed, manifested, or imparted These—and Himself in These—to us as in Jesus Christ.

But not only did Jesus Christ embody in Himself these our natural deficiencies, insufficiencies, and impossibilities, in order to bring them into conjunction and union with their predestined supplements and supplies—and so their own self-realization and completeness. There is no question that sin was, at the least, an inevitable and necessary moment or stage in human evolution: it was only over against, in contrast and opposition with, and victory over it, that human holiness could originate. Men can resist this or that sin and practise and cultivate this or that virtue—and so be really responsible within limits for what they do or are. But no man can be wholly sinless or wholly virtuous, or wholly righteous: and there is no doubt that a sense of the universal fact of sin was necessary to the rise of the counter sense of the need and want of holiness. Our Lord in His oneness with us shared, I say, not only our nature as it was naturally deficient, but our nature as it had actually fallen under the universal dominion of sin and death. It was God's purpose to show us in His Person what was its, at once natural and supernatural, redemption and deliverance from that subjection to sin and death. That salvation consisted in the substitution of an all-sufficient Holiness, Righteousness, and Life of God, instead of the impossible and yet necessary—all these—of humanity itself. It had to be that of

humanity itself, since humanity was created and constituted for it and predestined to it,—but it could not be, until humanity was lifted to the level of participation in it; could know the reason and meaning and feel the need and want of it. It was the province and function of the *Law* first to awaken and practically to create not only the fact of this necessity, but the sense and experience of this impossibility, and the consequent bitter need. This is what "the knowledge of sin" is, and it was the function of the Law to awaken and impart that knowledge.

Now the perfect act and work of Jesus in His whole life in the flesh was, primarily, to know all the limitations, and yet the limitless distinction and law, of the humanity that was His own and Himself: its at once bitter impossibility and yet absolute necessity of holiness, righteousness, and eternal life. Our Lord was not sinless because—in His (in itself) sinless humanity—He was above the touch or reach or power of sin. He knew He was not, and felt to the very bottom His need of and dependence upon the infinite and eternal Not Himself Who, as the only source of holiness, is the only victory over sin. "With strong crying and tears He made supplication and prayer unto Him that was able to save Him,—and was heard for His godly fear"—and so He mastered the great spiritual science and art of Faith and "learned obedience through the things He suffered." That Jesus Christ was thus humanly, in His own person and in His own life and death, the Author and Finisher or Perfecter of Faith in God, and of all that Faith makes possible and eventually makes actual in our humanity—is the great truth of Redemption or Salvation,—the Resurrection which as a Fact stands next and second only to that of the Incarnation.

The one real At-one-ment wrought by Christ with God was that of His own perfected human Faith, Hope, and Love,—or in other order, His own perfect Love, Obedience or Service, and Sacrifice. That alone, viewed as a single

act, was the extinction of sin, the destruction of death, the restoration of eternal life. Through that Faith, and its perfect work, comes the only true righteousness—that of which St. Paul speaks when he says: "In it (in the Gospel, which is Christ Himself) is revealed a righteousness of God by (or from) faith unto faith: as it is written, the righteous shall live by faith." And again: "But now apart from the law (which can only call for an impossible obedience, or righteousness of our own) a righteousness of God hath been manifested, even the righteousness of God through faith in Jesus Christ—unto all them that believe."

This is the spiritual reason and meaning, the end and purpose, the actual result of the Resurrection of Christ: in it God has given us a righteousness of His own to take and make our own. We need not hesitate on the one hand to view it as an actual and immediate work, self-revelation or manifestation, of God Himself in our nature and our life: "God was in Christ, reconciling (or at-oneing) the world unto Himself." Neither, on the other hand, must we hesitate or fail to see humanity or ourselves in Christ—through a victorious faith, hope, and love—in perfect love, faithful obedience and service, complete sacrifice—appropriating and assimilating, converting into itself (that is, into ourselves) the faith, hope and love, the service and sacrifice, the holiness, righteousness and eternal life—so freely given us, so perfectly wrought in us, so divinely realizing and fulfilling not only God in us, but us too in God Who is our Life.

An historic issue of explanation or interpretation may be put into the following form: Did Christ become incarnate that He might stand in the stead of man and endure the penalty of sin, so that "God might be just and yet the Justifier of him who believeth in Jesus"?—*Or*, did Christ become incarnate that He might, in some positive and real way, take upon Him and take away sin, and so become the actual holiness, righteousness and eternal life of man? Was His death the penal and punitive act of

justice upon sin, or was it the consummate act of holiness and righteousness in conferring and constituting Life? The fact that for man any birth or life to God or holiness must be a death to sin,—and *that*, for the deeper than merely actual reason, that any positive affirmation of good or right is a negative denial of bad or wrong,—rendered it necessary that Christ's perfect act of holiness ("I sanctify myself") should be a complete negation of sin—the life to the one, a death to the other. But, because it is both, shall we name the glorious and victorious death of Christ a penalty for sin rather than a conquest of holiness and eternal life? "I am come," He said, "that ye might have life": and the perfect act of life was the perfect negation, extinction, and death of sin, and so of death itself. For in man all true life is perpetual death, and death itself with the extraction of its sting, becomes only life—"a birth and an awaking." We are saved in the travail or "child-bearing" of the new birth from above.

There is a truth in the continued use of the terms "vicarious," "substitutionary," "instead of," etc., but it needs an immense amount of explaining and transcending. We do indeed plead—"represent, present, and plead"—Christ's death and life, His complete satisfaction for sin as well as His triumphant holiness, righteousness, and life, *instead of ours*. But it is a temporary truth: the "instead of us or ours" is a qualification for time not eternity, and the life in Christ is "eternal." It is ours now only in faith, in hope, and in love—not yet in all the actuality and reality of complete fact. But God sees us already complete in Christ: time does not for Him defer or obscure His perfect oneness with us: and He gives us —in His love, grace, and fellowship—and through our faith, hope, and love in response—to see ourselves as He sees us, in perfect oneness with Him—complete in Christ. Time, and even practically endless time (which, yet, is not and never eternity) is a necessary factor in relation to

us—as the condition of endless evolution and growth Godward. An instantaneous and completed heaven is inconceivable and impossible for us. We ought not to expect, short of eternity, to pass beyond the use and function of anticipatory and proleptic faith, hope, and love—a living ever in the future of perfect self-realization in the Infinite. How deep into that future probation too must extend—or even the formal freedom which is inseparable from possible failure and miscarriage—we cannot know. We do know that the right use and habit of such freedom leads assuredly and progressively to its transition into real freedom which eventually means freedom even from formal freedom—from the possibility of sin and death.

The danger of the terms "vicarious," "substitution," etc.—is that they have led and do lead into the error that redemption, salvation, righteousness, and all that Christianity promises and gives—is expressed in the objective and judicial act and status of acquittal from guilt and condemnation. To separate too widely the "done for us" or the "done instead of our doing" from the "done with and in and through and by us" and so the "*our* doing too"—has been the source of no little weakness and failure in our current Christianity. It would not if taken understandingly and faithfully.

Moreover vicarious penalty, or punishment by proxy is an attempt to safeguard the principle of justice by too severe a strain upon either reason or conscience. I should rather save it by the position: That, if it takes an eternity to be saved, no man is going to be saved or perfected until he knows the death and resurrection of Christ—knows as Christ knows what sin is and what holiness is—what Hell is and what Heaven is.

Jesus and Man

By T. R. Glover,
St. John's College, Cambridge.

When, on his last journey, Jesus came in sight of Jerusalem, Luke tells us that he wept (Lk. 19:41). There is an obvious explanation of this in the extreme tension under which he was living—everything turned upon the next few days, and everything would be decided at Jerusalem; but while he must have felt this, it cannot have been the cause of his weeping. Nor should we look for it altogether in the appeal which a great city makes to emotion.

> "Dull would he be of soul who could pass by
> A sight so touching in its majesty."

Yet it was not the architecture that so deeply moved Jesus; the temple, which was full in view, was comparatively new and foreign. He found it "a den of thieves" (Lk. 19:46); and he prophesied that it would be demolished, and of all its splendid buildings, its "goodly stones and votive offerings," which so much impressed his disciples, not one stone would be left upon another (Mk. 13:2, Lk. 21:5). But the traditions of Jerusalem wakened thoughts in him of the story of his people, thoughts with a tragic colour: Jerusalem was the place where prophets were killed (Lk. 13:33), the scene and centre, at once, of Israel's deepest emotions, highest hopes and most awful failures. "O Jerusalem, Jerusalem!" he had said in sadness, as he thought of Israel's holy city, "which killest the prophets and stonest them that are sent

unto thee, how often would I have gathered thy children together, as a hen doth gather her brood under her wings! —and ye would not!" (Lk. 13:34).

And now he is in sight of Jerusalem. The city and the temple suddenly meet his view as he reaches the height, and he is deeply moved. Any reflective mind might well have been stirred by the thought of the masses of men gathered there. Nothing is so futile as an arithmetical numbering of people, for after a certain point figures paralyse the imagination, and after that they tell the mind little or nothing. But here was actually assembled the Jewish people, coming in swarms from all the world, for the feast; here was Judaism at its most pious; here was the pilgrim centre with all it meant of aspiration and blindness, of simple folly and gross sin. The sight of the city—the doomed city, as he foresaw—the thought of his people, their zeal for God and their alienation from God—it all comes over him at once, and with a sudden rush of feeling, he apostrophizes Jerusalem—"If thou hadst known—even thou—at least in this thy day, the things which belong unto thy peace! But now they are hid from thine eyes! . . . Thou knewest not the time of thy visitation!" (Lk. 19:42–44).

It is quite plain from the Gospels that crowds had always an appeal for Jesus. When they came about him, they claimed him and possessed him. Over and over again, we read of his pity for them—"He saw a great multitude and was moved with compassion toward them" (Mt. 14:14)—of his thought for their weariness and hunger, his reflexion that they might "faint by the way" on their long homeward journeys (Mk. 8:3), and his solicitude about their food. Whatever modern criticism makes of the story of his feeding multitudes, it remains that he was markedly sensitive to the idea of hunger. Jairus is reminded that his little girl will be the better for food (Mk. 5:43). The rich are urged to make feasts for the poor, the maimed and the blind (Lk. 14:12). The

owner of the vineyard, in the parable, pays a day's wage for an hour's work, when an hour was all the chance that the unemployed labourer could find (Mt. 20:9). No sanctity could condone for the devouring of widows' houses (Mt. 23:14).

The great hungry multitudes haunt his mind. The story of the rich young ruler shows this (Mark 10:17–22). Here was a man of birth and education, whose face and whose speech told of a good heart and conscience—a man of charm, of the impulsive type that appealed to Jesus. Jesus "looked on him," we read. The words recall Plato's picture of Socrates looking at the jailer—how "he looked up at him in his peculiar way, like a bull"—the old man's prominent eyes were fixed upon the fellow, glaring through the brows above them, and Socrates' friends saw them and remembered them when they thought of the scene. As Jesus' eyes rested steadily on this young man, the disciples saw in them an expression they knew—"Jesus, looking on him, loved him." Their talk was of eternal life; and, no doubt to his surprise, Jesus asked the youth if he had kept the commandments; how did he stand as regarded murder, theft, adultery? The steady gaze followed the youth's impetuous answer, and then came the recommendation to sell all that he had and give to the poor—"and come, follow me!" At this, we read in a fragment of the *Gospel according to the Hebrews* (preserved by Origen), "the rich man began to scratch his head, and it did not please him. And the Lord said to him, 'How sayest thou, The law I have kept and the prophets? For it is written in the law, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself; and behold! many, who are thy brethren, sons of Abraham, are clad in filth and dying of hunger, and thy house is full of many good things, and nothing at all goes out from it to them.' And he turned and said to Simon, his disciple, who was sitting beside him: 'Simon, son of John, it is easier for a camel to go through a needle's eye, than for a rich man

to enter into the kingdom of Heaven.'" We need not altogether reject this variant of the story.

But it was more than the physical needs of the multitude that appealed to Jesus. "Man's Unhappiness, as I construe," says Teufelsdrockh in *Sartor Resartus*, "comes of his greatness; it is because there is an Infinite in him, which with all his cunning he cannot quite bury under the finite. Will the whole Finance Ministers and Upholsterers and Confectioners of modern Europe undertake, in joint-stock company, to make one Shoeblack happy?" We read, in a passage, which, it is true, is largely symbolic, that one of Jesus' quotations from the Old Testament was that "Man shall not live by bread alone" (Lk. 4:4). Hunger is a real thing—horribly real; but it is comparatively easy to deal with, and man has deeper needs. The Shoeblack, according to Teufelsdrockh, wants God's infinite universe altogether to himself—in the simpler words of Jesus, he is never happy till he says, "I will arise and go to my father" (Lk. 15:18).

This craving for the Father the men of Jesus' day tried to fill with the law; and, when the law failed to satisfy it, they had nothing further to suggest, except their fixed idea that "God heareth not sinners" (Jn. 9:31). They despaired of the great masses and left them alone. They did not realize, as Jesus did, that the Father also craves for his children. When Jesus saw the simpler folk thus forsaken, the picture rose in his mind of sheep, worried by dogs or wolves, till they fell, worn out,—sheep without a shepherd (Mt. 9:36). Everyone remembers the shepherd of the parable, who sought the one lost sheep till he found it, and how he brought it home on his shoulders (Lk. 15:5).[1] But

[1]The "Good Shepherd," by the way, is a phrase from the fourth Gospel (Jn. 10:11), but we think most often of the Good Shepherd as carrying the sheep; and that comes from Luke, and is in all likelihood nearer the parable of Jesus.

there is another parable we might almost say, of ninety and nine lost sheep—a parable, not developed, but implied in this passage of Matthew, and it is as significant as the other; for our Good Shepherd has to ask his friends to help him in this case—the one instance, perhaps, of his asking for prayer. The appeal that lay in the sheer misery and helplessness of masses of men was one of the foundations of the Christian Church.

It is worth noting that Jesus stands alone in refusing to despair of the greater part of mankind. Contempt was in his eyes the unpardonable sin (Mt. 5:22). How swift and decisive is his anger with those who make others stumble (Lk. 17:2). The parable of the lost sheep reveals what he held to be God's feeling for the hopeless man, and his constant aim is to lead men to "think like God." The lost soul matters to God. He sums up his own work in the world in much the same language as he uses about the shepherd in the parable: "The Son of Man is come to seek and to save that which is lost" (Lk. 19:10). The taunt that he was the "friend of publicans and sinners" really described what he was and wished to be (Lk. 7:34). God was their Heavenly Father. The sight, then, of the masses of his countrymen, like worried sheep, worn, scattered, lost and hopeless, waked in him no shade of doubt—on the contrary, it was further proof to him of the soundness of his message. Changing his simile, he told the disciples that the harvest was great, but the labourers few, and he asked them to pray the Lord of the harvest to thrust forth labourers into his harvest (Mt. 9:38). The very name "Lord of the harvest" implies faith in God's competence and understanding. From the first, he seems to have held up before his followers that this wide service was to be their work—"Come ye after me," he said, "and I will make you to become fishers of men" (Mk. 1:17) —men who should really "catch men" (Lk. 5:10).

Like all for whom the world has had a meaning, Jesus

accepted the necessary conditions of man's life. Human misery and need were widespread, but God's Fatherhood was of compass fully as wide, and Jesus relied upon it; "your Father knows" (Mt. 6:32), he said, and "with God all things are possible" (Mk. 10:27). The very miseries of the oppressed and hopeless people added grounds to his confidence. People who had touched bottom in sounding the human spirit's capacity for misery were for him the "ripe harvest" (Mt. 9:37), only needing to be gathered (Mk 4:29). He understood them, and he knew he had the healing for all their troubles. With full assurance of the truth of his words, he cried: "Come unto me all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest" (Mt. 11:28). He spoke of a rest which he knew, and there is a tenderness in his words which careless familiarity obscures for us. What understanding and sympathy he shows, when he adds: "My yoke is easy and my burden is light!" Misery, poverty and hunger, he had found, taught men to see realities. The hungry at least were not likely to mistake a stone for bread—they had a ready test for it on which they could rely. Poverty threw open the road to the Kingdom of God. The clearing away of all temporary satisfactions, of all that cloaked the soul's deepest needs, prepared men for real relations with the greatest Reality—with God. So that Jesus boldly said: "Blessed are ye poor," "Blessed are ye that hunger now," "Blessed are ye that weep now"; but he had no idea that they were always to weep. If it was his to care for men's hunger, it was not likely that he would have no comfort for their tears—"Ye shall find rest unto your souls" (Mt. 11:29) —"they shall be comforted" (Mt. 5:4).

It was in large part upon the happiness which he was bringing to the poor that Jesus based his claim to be heard. There is little reasonable ground for doubt that he healed diseases. Of course we cannot definitely pronounce now upon any individual case reported; the diag-

nosis might be too hasty and the trouble other than supposed; but it is well known that such healings do occur, and that they occurred in Jesus' ministry, we can quite well believe. So when he was challenged as to his credentials, he pointed to misery relieved; and the culmination of everything, the crowning feature of his work he found in his "good news for the poor." The phrase he borrowed from Isaiah 61:1, but he made it his own —the splendid promises in Isaiah for "the poor, the broken-hearted, captives, blind and bruised" appealed to him. Time has laid its hand upon his word and dulled its freshness. "Gospel" and "evangelical" are no longer words of sheer happiness like Jesus' "good news"—they are technical terms, used in handbooks and in controversy; while for Jesus the "good news for the poor" was a new word of delight and inspiration.

The centre in all the thoughts of Jesus, as we have to remind ourselves again and again, is God. If, as Dr. D. S. Cairns puts it, "Jesus Christ is the great believer in man," it is, if we are reading him aright at all—because God believes in man. Let us remind ourselves often of that. "Thou hast made us for Thyself," said Augustine in the famous sentence, of which we are apt to emphasize the latter half, "and our heart knows no rest till it rests in Thee." Jesus would have us emphasize the former clause as well, and believe it. The keynote of his whole story is God's love; the Father is a real father—strange that one should have to write the small "f" to get the meaning! All that Jesus has taught us of God, we must bring to bear on man. For it is hard to believe in man—"what is man that thou shouldest magnify him? and that thou shouldest set thine heart upon him?" quotes the author of *Job* in a great ironical passage (Job 7:17 from Psalm 8:4). The elements and the stars come over us, as they came over George Fox in the Vale of Beavor—what *is* man? Can one out of fifteen hundred millions of human beings living on one planet matter to God, when there

are so many planets and stars, and there have been so many other generations? Can he matter? It all depends on how we conceive of God. Here it is essential to give all the meaning to the term "God" that Jesus gave to it, to believe in God as Jesus believed in God, if we are to understand the fulness of Jesus' "good news." It all depends on God—on whether Jesus was right about God; and after all on Jesus himself. "A thing of price is man," wrote Synesius, about 410 A. D., "because for him Christ died." The two things go together—Jesus' death and Jesus' theocentric thought of man.

It is a familiar criticism of idealists and other young hearts that it is easy to idolize what one does not know. *Omne ignotum pro magnifico,* is the old epigram of Tacitus. It is not every believer in man, not every "Friend of Man," who knows men as Jesus did. Like Burns and Carlyle and others who have interpreted man to us to some purpose, he grew up in the home of labouring people. He was a working man himself, a carpenter. He must have learned his carpentry exactly as every other boy learns it, hammering his fingers instead of the nail, sawing his own skin instead of the wood—and not doing it again. He knew what it was to have an aching back, and sweat on the face; how hard money is to earn, and how quickly it goes. He makes it clear that money is a temptation to men, and a great danger; but he never joins the moralists and the cranks in denouncing it. He sees what can be done with money, what a tool it can be in a wise man's hands—how he can make friends "by means of the Mammon of unrighteousness" (Lk. 16:9), for example, by giving unexpectedly generous wages to men who missed their chances (Mt. 20:15), by feeding Lazarus at the gate, and perhaps by having his sores properly attended to (Lk. 16:20). That he understood how pitifully the loss of a coin can affect a household of working people, one of his most beautiful parables bears witness (Lk. 15:8–10). With work he had no quarrel.

He draws many of his parables from labour, and he implies throughout that it is the natural and right thing for man. To be holy in his sense, a man need not leave his work. Clement of Alexandria, in his famous saying about the ploughman going on ploughing and singing as he ploughs, is in the vein of Jesus. There were those whom he called to leave all, to distribute their wealth and to follow him; but he chose them (Mk. 3:13, 14), it was not his one command for all men (cf. Mk. 5:19). But, as we shall shortly see, it is implied by his judgments of men that he believed in work and liked men who "put their backs" into it—their backs, yes, and their brains too.

Pain, the constant problem of man, perhaps more of woman—of unmarried woman more especially—he never discussed as modern people discuss it. He never made light of pain any more than of poverty; he understood physical as well as moral distress. Nor did he, like some of his contemporaries and some modern people, exaggerate the place of pain in human experience. He shared pain, he sympathized with suffering; and his understanding of pain, and above all, his choice of pain taught men to reconsider it and to understand it, and altered the attitude of the world toward it. It was made in those days a taunt against his disciples that he "suffered"—a god and a godlike man, men said, *could* not suffer; Jesus was *pathetos* (a word of taunting), he was "susceptible of suffering," and so far was he from sharing a god's glorious exemption from pain and death, that he was subjected to a death of exceptional anguish and shame. His tenderness for the suffering of others taught mankind a new sympathy, and the *nosokomeion*, the hospital for the sick, is one of the first of Christian institutions to rise when persecution stopped and Christians could build. "And the blind and the lame came to him in the temple, and he healed them," says Matthew (21:14) in a memorable phrase. I have heard it suggested that it was irregular

for them to come into the temple courts; but they gravitated naturally to Jesus.

The mystic is never quite at leisure for other people's feelings and sufferings; he is essentially an individualist; he must have his own intercourse with God, and other people's affairs are apt to be an interruption, an impertinence. "I have not been thinking about the community; I have been thinking of Christ," said a Bengali to me, who was wavering somewhere between the Brahma Samaj and Christianity. The Blessed Angela of Foligno was rather glad to be relieved of her husband and children, who died and left her leisure to enjoy the love of God. All this is quite unlike the real spirit of the historical Jesus—"Himself took our infirmities, and bare our sicknesses," was a phrase of Isaiah that came instinctively to the minds of his followers (Mt. 8:17, roughly after Isaiah 53:4). Perhaps when we begin to understand what is meant by the Incarnation, we may find that omnipotence has a great deal more to do than we have supposed with natural sympathy and the genius for entering into the sorrows and sufferings of other people.

One side of the work of Jesus must never be forgotten. His attitude to woman has altered her position in the world. No one can study society in classical antiquity or the non-Christian lands with any intimacy, and not realize this. Widowhood in Hinduism, marriage among Mohammedans—they are proverbs for the misery of women. Even the Jew still prays: "Blessed art thou, O Lord our God! King of the Universe, who hast not made me a woman." The Jewish woman has to be grateful to God because He "hath made me according to His will"—a thanksgiving with a different note, as the modern Jewess, Amy Levy, emphasized in her brilliant novel, where her heroine, very like herself, corrected her prayer book to make it more explicit—"Cursed art thou, O Lord our God! who hast made me a woman." Paul must have known these Jewish prayers, for he emphasizes

that in Christ there is neither male nor female (Gal. 3:28). Paul had his views—the familiar old ways of Tarsus inspired them[2]—as to woman's dress and deportment, especially the veil; but he struck the real Christian note here and emphasized the fact of what Jesus had done and is doing for woman. There is no reference made by Jesus to woman that is not respectful and sympathetic; he never warns men against women. Even the most degraded women find in him an amazing sympathy; for he has the secret of being pure and kind at the same time—his purity has not to be protected; it purifies to some purpose. He draws some of his most delightful parables from woman's work. It is recorded how, when he spoke of the coming disasters of Jerusalem, he paused to pity poor pregnant women and mothers with little babies in those bad times (Lk. 21:23, Mt. 24:19). Critics have remarked on the place of woman in Luke's Gospel, and some have played with fancies as to the feminine sources whence he drew his knowledge—did the women who ministered to Jesus, Joanna, for instance, the wife of Chuza (Lk. 8:3), tell him these illuminative stories of the Master? In any case, Jesus' new attitude to woman is in the record; and it has so reshaped the thoughts of mankind, and made it so hard to imagine anything else, that we do not readily grasp what a revolution he made—here as always by referring men's thoughts back to the standard of God's thoughts, and supporting what he taught by what he was.

Mark gives us one of our most familiar pictures of Jesus sitting with a little child on his knee and in the crook of his arm. (The Greek *enenkalisamenos* in Mk. 9:36 and 10:16 is worth remembering—it is vivid enough.) Mothers brought their children to him "that he should put his hands on them and pray" (Mt. 19:13). Mat-

[2]The more or less contemporary Greek orator, Dio Chrysostom, refers to the old-fashioned ways of the Tariots, especially mentioning their insistence on women wearing veils.

thew (21:15) says children took part in the triumphal entry; and Jesus, clear as he was how much the hosannas of the grown people meant, seems to have enjoyed the children's part in the strange scene. Classical literature and Christian literature of those ages offer no parallel to his interest in children. The beautiful words, "Suffer little children to come unto me," are his, and they are characteristic of him (Mt. 19:14); and he speaks of God's interest in children (Mt. 18:14)—once more the reference of everything to God, to get it in its true perspective. How Jesus likes children:—for their simplicity (Lk. 18:17), their intuition, their teachableness, we say. But was it not, perhaps, for far simpler and more natural reasons—just because they *were* children, and little and delightful? We forget his little brothers and sisters—or we eliminate them for theological purposes.

Jesus lays a quite unexpected emphasis on sheer tenderness—on kindness to neighbour and stranger, the instinctive humanity that helps men, if it be only by the swift offer of a cup of cold water (Mt. 10:42). The good Samaritan came as a surprise to some of his hearers (Lk. 10:30 ff.). "It is our religion," said a Hindu to a missionary to explain why he and other Hindus did not help to rescue a fainting man from the railway lines, nor even offered water to restore him, when the missionary had hauled him on to the platform unaided. Not so the religion of Jesus—"bear ye one another's burdens, and so fulfil the law of Christ," wrote Paul (Gal. 6:2)—"pursue hospitality" (Rom. 12:13), the very word runs through the Epistles of the New Testament. The Last Judgment itself turns on "little unremembered acts of kindness and of love," which in Jesus' view, as in Wordsworth's, give the character to a man's life.

It is urged that such things are natural to man—"do not even the publicans the same?" (Mt. 5:45)—Jesus carries the matter a long way further. "Whosoever shall compel thee to go a mile, go with him twain" (Mt. 5:41).

The man who would use such compulsion would be the alien soldier, the hireling of Herod or of Rome; and who would wish to cart him and his goods even one mile? "Go two miles," says Jesus—or, if the Syriac translation preserves the right reading, "Go two extra." Why? Well, the soldier is a man after all, and by such unsolicited kindness you may make a friend even of a government official—not always an easy thing to do,—at any rate you can help him; God helps him. "Be ye therefore perfect even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect" (Mt. 5:48). Ordinary kindness and tenderness could hardly be urged beyond that point; and yet Jesus goes further still. He would have us *pray* for those that despitefully use us (Mt. 5:44)—and in no Pharisaic way, but with the same instinctive love and friendliness that he always used himself. "Father, forgive them; for they know not what they do" (Lk. 23:34). There are religions which inculcate the tolerance of wrong in order to equanimity of mind or acquisition of merit. But Jesus implies on the contrary that in all this also the Christian *denies* himself, does not seek even in this way to save his own soul, but forgets all about it in the service of others, though he finds by and by with a start that he has saved it far more effectually than he could have expected (Mk. 8:35; Mt. 25:37–40). The emphasis falls on our duty of kindness and tenderness to all men and women, because we and they are alike God's children.

With his emphasis on tenderness we may group his teaching on forgiveness. He makes the forgiving spirit an antecedent of prayer—"when ye stand praying, forgive, if ye have aught against any; that your Father also, which is in heaven, may forgive you your trespasses" (Mk. 11:25). "If thou bring thy gift to the altar, and there rememberest that thy brother hath aught against thee, leave there thy gift before the altar, and go thy way, first be reconciled to thy brother, and then come and offer thy gift" (Mt. 5:23–24). The parable of the

King and his debtor, painfully true to human nature, brings out the whole matter of our forgiveness of one another into the light; we are shown it from God's outlook. The teaching, as ever, is theocentric (Mt. 18:23–35). To Peter Jesus says that a man should be prepared to forgive his brother to seventy times seven—if anybody can keep count so far (Mt. 18:21–35). He sees how quarrels injure life, and alienate a man from God. Hence comes the famous saying: "Resist not evil; but whosoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also" (Mt. 5:39). He would have men even avoid criticism of one another (Mt. 7:1–5). Epigrams are seductive, and there is a fascination in the dissection of character, but there is always a danger that a clever characterization, a witty label, may conclude the matter, that a possible friendship may be lost through the very ingenuity with which the man has been labelled who might have been a friend. It is not a small matter in Jesus' eyes; he puts his view very strongly (Mt. 5:22); and as we must always remember, he bases himself on fact. We may lose a good deal more than we think by letting our labels stand between us and his words, by our habit of calling them paradoxes and letting them go at that.

It is worth while to look at the type of character he admires. Modern painters have often pictured Jesus as something of a dreamer, a long-haired, sleepy, abstract kind of person. What a contrast we find in the energy of the real Jesus,—in the straight and powerful language which he uses to men, in the sweep and range of his mind, in the profundity of his insight, the drive and compulsiveness of his thinking, in the venturesomeness of his actions. How many of the parables turn on energy? The real trouble with men, he seems to say, is again sheer slackness; they will not put their minds to the thing before them, whether it is thought or action. Thus, for instance, the parable of the talents turns on energetic thinking and decisive action; and these are things Jesus

always admires—in the virgins who thought ahead and brought extra oil (Mt. 25:4),—in the vigorous man who found the treasure and made sure of it (Mt. 13:44),—in the friend at midnight at the door, who hammered, hammered, hammered till he got his loaves (Lk. 11:8),—in the "violent" who "take the kingdom of Heaven by force" (Mt. 11:12), (Lk. 16:16),—in the man who will hack off his hand to enter into life definitely (Mk. 9:43). Even the bad steward he commends, because he put his mind on his situation (Lk. 16:8). Indecision is one of the things that in his judgment will keep a man outside the kingdom of God, that make him unfit for it. The matter deserves more study than we commonly give it. You must have a righteousness, he says, which *exceeds* the righteousness of the Pharisees (Mt. 5:20); and the Pharisees were professionals in righteousness. His tests of discipleship illumine his ideal of character—the Theocentric life, God the centre—negation of self, the thought-out life. He will have his disciples count the cost, reckon their forces, calculate quietly the risks before them—right up to the Cross (Lk. 14:27–33)—like John Bunyan in Bedford gaol, where he thought things out to the pillory and thence to the gallows, so that, if it came to the gallows, he should be ready, as he says, to leap off the ladder blindfold into eternity. That is the energy of mind that Jesus asks of men, that he admires in men.

On the other side he is always against the life of drift, the half-thought-out life. There they were, he says, in the days of Noah, eating, drinking, marrying, dreaming—and the flood came and destroyed them (Lk. 17:27). So ran the old familiar story; and, says Jesus, it is always true; men will drift and dream for ever, heedless of fact, heedless of God,—and then ruin, life gone, the soul lost, the Son of Man come, and "you yourselves thrust out" (Lk. 13:39 with Mt. 25:10–13). It is quite striking with what a variety of impressive pictures Jesus drives

home his lesson. There is the person who everlastingly *says* and does not *do* (Mt. 23:3)—who promises to work and does not work (Mt. 21:28)—who receives a new idea with enthusiasm but has not depth of nature enough for it to root itself (Mt. 4:17)—who builds on sand, the Mr. Anything of Bunyan's allegory; nor these alone. For Jesus is as plain about the unpunctual (Lk. 13:25), the easy-going (Lk. 12:47), the sort that compromises, that tries at once to serve God and mammon (Mt. 6:24)—all the practical half-and-half people that take their bills quickly and write fifty, that offer God and man about half what they owe them of thought and character and action, and bid others do the same, and count themselves men of the world for their acuteness (Lk. 16:1–8). And to do them justice, Jesus commends them; they have taken the exact measure of things "in their generation." Their mistake lies in their equation of the fugitive and eternal; and it is the final and fatal mistake according to Jesus, and a very common one, forgetfulness of God, in fact (Lk. 12:20), a mistake that comes from *not* thinking things out. Jesus will have men think everything out to the very end. "He never says: Come unto me, all ye who are too lazy to think for yourselves." (H. S. Coffin.) It is energy of mind that he calls for—either with me or against me. He does not recognize neutrals in his war—"he that is not against us, is for us" (Lk. 9:50)—"he that is not with me is against me" (Mt. 12:30).

Where does a man's *Will* point him? That is the question. "Out of the abundance, the overflow, of the heart, the mouth speaketh" (Mt. 12:34). What is it that a man *wills*, purity or impurity (Mt. 5:28)? It is the inner energy that makes a man; what he says, does, is an overflow from what is within—an overflow, it is true, with a reaction. It is what a man *chooses*, and what he *wills*, that Jesus always emphasizes: "God knoweth your hearts" (Lk. 16:15). Very well then, does

a man choose God? That is the vital issue. Does he choose God without reserve, and in a way that God, knowing his heart, will call a whole-hearted choice?

St. Augustine, in a very interesting passage (Confessions 8:9–21) remarks upon the fact that, when the mind commands the body, obedience is instantaneous, but that, when it commands itself, it meets with resistance. "The mind commands that the mind shall will—it is one and the same mind, and it does not obey." He finds the reason; the mind does not absolutely and entirely (*ex toto*) will the thing, and so it does not absolutely and entirely command it. "There is nothing strange after all in this," he says, "partly to will, partly not to will; but it is a weakness of the mind, that it does not arise in its entirety, uplifted by truth, because it is borne down by habit. Thus there are two wills, because one of them is not complete."

The same thought is to be traced in the teaching of Jesus. It is implied in what he says about prayer. There is a want of faith, a half-heartedness, about men's prayers; they pray as Augustine says he himself did: "Give me chastity and continence, but not now" (Confessions 8:7–17). That is not what Jesus means by prayer—the utterance of the half-will. Nor is it this sort of surrender to God that Jesus calls for—no, the question is, how thoroughly is a man going to put himself into God's hands? Does he mean to be God's up to the cross and beyond? Does he enlist absolutely on God's terms, without a bargain with God, prepared to accept God's will, whatever it is, whether it squares with his liking, or not? (cf. Lk. 17:7–10). Are his own desires finally out of the reckoning? Does he, in fact, *deny*—negate—himself (Matt. 8:34)? Jesus calls for disciples, with questions so penetrating on his lips. What a demand to make of men! What faith, too, in men it shows, that he can ask all this with no hint of diminished seriousness!

Jesus is the great believer in man. The choice of his twelve shows it. In Peter, for instance, he believed, as some one has put it, "against all the evidence." To that group of disciples he trusts the supremest task men ever had assigned to them. Not many wise, not many mighty, Paul found at Corinth; and it has always been so. Is it not still the gist of the Gospel, that Jesus believes in the writer and the reader of these lines—trusts them with the propagation of God's Kingdom—incredible commission? Jesus was always at leisure for individuals; this was the natural outcome of his faith in men. What else is the meaning of his readiness to spend himself in giving the utmost spiritual truth—no easy task, as experience shows us—even to a solitary listener? If we accept what he tells us of God, we can believe that the individual is worth all that Jesus did and does for him, but hardly otherwise. "His gift of discovering interest in uninteresting people," says Phillips Brooks, "was an intellectual habit that he gave to his disciples." We think too much "like men"; He would have us "think like God" and think better of odd units and items of humanity than statesmen and statisticians are apt to do. It has been pointed out lately how fierce he is about the man who puts a stumbling block in the way of even "a little one"—"better for him that a millstone were hanged about his neck, and that he were drowned in the depth of the sea"; no mere phrase—for when he draws a picture he sees it; he sees this scene, and "better so—for him too!" is his comment (Lk. 17:2). There was, we may remember, a view current in antiquity that when a man was drowned, his soul perished with his body, though I do not know if the Jews held this opinion. It is not likely that Jesus did. What is God's mind, God's conduct, toward these people whom men think they can afford to despise? "Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father in heaven is perfect" (Mt. 5:48). What a tremendous conclusion! And they are

the words of one who meant what he said. And to whom did he say it? To the most ordinary people, to Peter and James and John; for all sorts of people he held up this impossible ideal of a perfection like God's. What a faith in man it implies: "All things are possible to him that believes" (Mk. 9:23). Why should not *you* believe? he says.

His faith in the soul's possibilities is boundless, and in marked contrast with what men think of themselves. A man, for instance, will say that he has done his best; but nine times out of ten it means mere fatigue; he is not going to trouble to do any more. How can a man know that he has done his best? The Gospel of Jesus comes with its message of the grace of God, and the power of God, to people who are stupid and middle-aged, who are absolutely settled in life, who are conscious of their limitations, who know they are living in a rut and propose to stick to it for the remainder of their days; and Jesus tells them in effect that he means to give them a new life altogether, that he means to have from them service perfectly incredible to them. No man, he suggests, need be so inured to the stupidity of middle-age, but there may be a miraculous change in him. A great many people need reconversion at forty-five, however Christian they have been before.

This belief of his in the individual man, and in the worth of the individual, is the very charter of Democracy. The original writings of William Tyndal, who first translated the New Testament from Greek into English, contain the essential ideas of Democracy already in 1526 —the outcome of familiar study of the Gospel. Jesus himself said of Herod, "Go and tell that fox" (Lk. 13:32). Herod was a king, but he was not above criticism; and Christians have not failed at times to make the criticisms of the great that Truth requires.

Jesus has no illusions about men, he sees the weak spots; he recognizes the "whited sepulchre" (Mt. 23:27).

He is astonished at the unbelief of men and women (Mk. 6:6). He does not understand why they cannot think (Mk. 8:2), but he notes how they see and yet do not see, hear and do not understand (Mt. 13:13), even in religion. He is impressed by their falsity (Mt. 15:8). He knows perfectly well the evil of which the human heart is capable (Mt. 15:19). A man who steadily looks forward to being crucified by the people he is trying to save, is hardly one of the absent-minded enthusiasts, miscalled idealists. There never was, we feel, one who so thoroughly looked through his friends, who loved them so much and yet without a shade of illusion.

In the meantime let us recall what he makes of the wasted life. "In thinking of the case," said Seeley, "they had forgotten the woman"—a common occurrence with those who deal with "cases." It was once said severely of the Head of a College that "if he would leave off caring for his students' souls and care for *them*, he would do better." Jesus does not forget the man in caring for his soul—he likes *him*. He is the "friend of publicans and sinners" (Lk. 7:34); he "eats and drinks" with them (Mk. 2:14). Let us remember again that these were taunts and were meant to sting; they were not conventional phrases. See how he can enter into the life of a poor creature. There is the wretched little publican, Zacchaeus (Lk. 19:1–10)—a squalid little figure of a man, whom people despised. He was used to contempt —it was the portion of the tax-collector, enlisted in Roman service against his own people. Jesus comes and sees him up in the tree; he instantly realizes what is happening and invites himself to the house of Zacchaeus as a guest; something passes between them without spoken word. The little man slides down the tree—not a proceeding that makes for dignity; and then, with all his inches, he stands up before the whole town, that knew him so well, in a new moral grandeur that adds cubits to his stature. "Half my goods," he says, "I give to the

poor. If I have taken anything from any man by false accusation, he shall have it back fourfold." That man belonged to the despised classes. Jesus came into his life; the man became a new man, a pioneer of Christian generosity. Again there is the woman with the alabaster box—the mere possession of which stamped her for what she was. It was simply a case of the wasted life. I have long wondered if she meant to give him only some of the ointment. A little of it would have been a great gift. But perhaps the lid of the box jammed, and she realized in a moment that it was to be all or nothing;—she drew off her sandals and smashed the box to pieces. However she broke it, and whatever her reasons, St. Mark's word means that it was thoroughly and finally shivered. Something had happened, which made this woman the pioneer of the Christian habit of giving all for Jesus. The disciples said that they had done so (Mt. 19:27), but they were looking for thrones in exchange (Mk. 10:37); she was not. The thief on the cross himself becomes a pioneer for mankind in the Christian way of prayer. "Jesus, remember me," he says (Lk. 23:42). How is it that Jesus comes into the wasted life and makes it new? There is no special machinery, no fixed method, but always friendship and love. As St. Augustine says, "One loving spirits sets another on fire."

With all his wide outlook on mankind, his great purpose to capture all men, Jesus is remarkable for his omission to devise machinery or organization for the accomplishment of his ends. The tares are left to grow with the wheat (Mt. 13:30)—as if Jesus trusted the wheat a good deal more than we do. Alive as he is to the evil in human nature, he never tries to take men out of it, and he seems to have been very little afraid of it. He believed in the power of good—because, after all, God is "Lord of the Harvest" (Mt. 9:38). He invents no special methods—a loving heart will hit the method needed in the particular case; the Holy Spirit will teach

this as well as other things (Mt. 10:19–20). How far he even organized his church, or left it to organize itself if it so wished, students may discuss. Does not what we mean by the Incarnation imply putting everything in the long run on man, quickened into new life by a new relation with God and taught a new love of man by Jesus himself? The heart of friendship and the heart of the Incarnation are in essence the same thing—giving oneself in frankness and love to him who will accept, and by them winning him who refuses.

Has not this been the secret of the spread of the Gospel? The simplicity of the whole thing, and the power of it, grow upon us as we study them. But, after all, as Tertullian said, simplicity and power are the constant marks of God's work—simplicity in method, power in effect.

Islam at its Best

By S. M. Zwemer, D.D.,
Editor of The Moslem World.

It was a noble word and that of a true missionary statesman which the Rev. H. H. Jessup, D.D., uttered in the opening address of the First Missionary Conference on behalf of the Mohammedan World held at Cairo in April, 1906:—"I have been thinking of the mightiest system of monotheism the world has ever known, 'shadowing with wings' the great continents of Asia and Africa, having in its progress stamped out of existence tens of thousands of Christian churches, and riveted upon 200,000,000 of men its doctrines, polity, ceremonial, and code of laws, and imbedded itself in the Arabic language like the nummulite fossils in the ledges of Jebel Mokattam, until it stands to-day like a towering mountain range whose summits are gilded with the light of the great truths of God's existence and unity, and whose foothills run down into the sloughs of polygamy and oppression and degradation of women."

The missionary is compelled to dwell among the foothills. His work brings him face to face with dark practices and degrading superstitions, which rest to so large an extent upon the vast majority of the homes and hearts in Moslem lands; but he should lift up his eyes to the towering mountain ranges also. There, even in Islam, he can see something of the glory of that Light which enlighteneth every man that cometh into the world.

In the Theological Seminary of the American Mission

at Cairo, the attempt has been made for three years past to deal constructively with Islam in the study of comparative religion, and lead the eager and able Coptic students to see the best in the Moslem creed and practices, and seize it as a point of contact and departure in the work of evangelization. It is not remarkable that the best side of Islam is not the most popular. Yet Moslems themselves are beginning everywhere to lay stress on the higher teachings of their Prophet and the more spiritual aspects of their religion.

In the historical study of Islam four names stand out supreme. They are those of Mohammed himself, because of the Koran, of al-Bukhari, the chief collector of the Traditions, of al-Ash'ari, the great dogmatic theologian, and of al-Ghazali, the reformer and mystic. The last named has left a larger imprint upon the history of Islam than any man save Mohammed himself. "If there had been a prophet after Mohammed," said es-Suyuti, "it would have been al-Ghazali."

It is in his life, and more especially in his writings, that I believe we can see Islam at its best. In trying to escape the dead weight of Tradition and the formalism of its requirements, Moslems are more and more finding relief in the way of the mystic. Of all those who have found a deeper spiritual meaning in the teachings of the Koran and even in the multitudinous and puerile details of the Moslem ritual, none can equal al-Ghazali. "He was," says Jamal-ud-Din, "the pivot of existence and the common pool of refreshing waters for all, the soul of the purest part of the people of the Faith, and the road for obtaining the satisfaction of the Merciful. . . . He became the unique one of his own day and for all time among the Moslem learned." "Al-Ghazali," said another writer, nearly contemporary, "is an *imam* by whose name breasts are dilated and souls revived, in whose literary productions the ink horn exults and the paper quivers with joy and at the hearing of whose message

voices are hushed and heads are bowed." And should this praise seem oriental and extravagant, we add the words of Professor Duncan B. Macdonald, who has made a more thorough study of al-Ghazali's life and writings than any other student of Islam:—"What rigidity of grasp the hand of Islam would have exercised but for the influence of al-Ghazali might be hard to tell; he saved it from scholastic decrepitude, opened before the orthodox Moslem the possibility of a life hid in God, was persecuted in his life as a heretic, and now ranks as the greatest doctor of the Moslem Church."

To understand the importance of al-Ghazali and of his teaching we must remember the time in which he lived. We cannot understand a man unless we know his environment. Biography is a thread but history is a web, in which time is broad as well as long. Al-Ghazali belongs to the small company of torch-bearers in the Dark Ages. He was born at Tus, in Khorasan, Persia, in the year 1058, and died in 1111 A.D. When al-Ghazali was born Togrul Bey had just taken Bagdad, Henry IV was Emperor, Nicholas II was Pope, the Norman conquest had just begun in the west, and Asia Minor was overrun by the Turks in the Near East. Among his contemporaries in the west were Abelard, St. Bernard, Anselm, and Peter the Hermit. About the time when he wrote his greatest work Godfrey of Bouillon was King of Jerusalem. Al-Ghazali was struggling with the problem of Islam and its philosophy in their relation to the human heart in its thirst after God, three hundred years after el-Kindi had written his remarkable apology for the Christian faith at the court of Haroun al Rashid and two hundred years before Raymond Lull laid down his life as a martyr preaching the Gospel to the Moslems in North Africa. How different the course of history might have been if either of these thinkers and advocates of the Christian faith had met al-Ghazali face to face.

In his day the crusaders by their outward hostility

toward Moslem rule and the inward degradation and hopeless divisions of Oriental Christianity, did not show forth the love and the life of Christ to Moslems. We must not be surprised, therefore, that there is little tolerance toward the followers of the Nazarene in al-Ghazali. He always honors their Prophet, but despises His disciples and their teaching, nay, even seems to ignore Christianity altogether in his account of Current Religions and Philosophies. Yet he must have come into close contact with Christians of all sorts during his travels and especially while living in Damascus.

He began the study of theology at an early age in the school at Nishapur. After the death of his teacher he attached himself to the famous Vizier Nizam al-mulk, who had gathered the most illustrious men of his time about him. Al-Ghazali soon became victor in the public disputations popular at that time, and the caravans carried his fame abroad. In 1054 he became a teacher at the Nizamiyya School at Bagdad. After four years he resigned his post in favor of his brother Ahmed to prosecute philosophical studies.

At this time a crisis occurred in his life which, were we to use Christian terminology, could be called his conversion. He had fallen into doubts and lost all his early beliefs. This unhappy state, he tells us, lasted about two months, during which time he was essentially a thorough-going sceptic. At last he found his way back to a firm faith in three things, God, inspiration and the last judgment. Together with this crisis in his thinking there came a desire for a deeper devotion. "Finally," he says, "I saw that the only condition of success was to sacrifice honors and riches and to sever the ties and attachments of worldly life. . . . Conscious of my weakness and the prostration of my soul, I took refuge in God as a man at the end of himself and without resources. He Who hears the wretched when they cry deigned to hear me. He made easy to me the sacrifice of honors,

wealth and family." For the space of eleven years he withdrew from the world and gave himself up to ascetic practices. He travelled to Damascus, Jerusalem, Mecca and Alexandria. On his return he set himself to reconciling science with faith and plunged deeply into the pantheistic mysticism of the Sufis. Toward the close of his life he returned to his native town of Tus, taught for a period at Nishapur and died in that city on December 19, 1111.

More is known of al-Ghazali's writings than of the man himself. The meagre facts of his biography, and even the spelling of his name, are disputed. His own pen, however, left a large and rich legacy. Moslem writers speak of his ninety-nine works, and Brockelmann (*Geschichte der Arabischen Litteratur*) tells of sixty-nine which are still in existence. They include his systems of theology, eschatology, his three famous works on philosophy, popular lectures on mysticism, moral treatises, and works on canon law. His famous Confessions (*Munqidh min al-dalal*) may be compared with those of St. Augustine or John Bunyan. Translations of some of his shorter writings have appeared in Hebrew, Latin, German, French and English.

One of the most interesting of all Ghazali's books and now used as a text-book in our Theological Seminary, is that on the names of God, entitled *Al Maksad ul-Asna Sharh-asma-Allah ul 'Husna*, "The Highest Aim, the Explanation of the Beautiful Names of God." The book is divided into three parts of which the first deals philosophically with the meaning of the word "name" and its distinction from the naming of the thing and the thing named itself; also how it is possible for God to have many names and yet to be one essence. The second part of the book is the longest and treats of the ninety-nine names or attributes of God in order, showing how they are all comprehended in the seven attributes and the one essence. The third part is an appendix showing that there are really more than ninety-nine names but

that this was the number fixed upon for good reasons! And finally there is a section telling how God may and how he may not be described.

He teaches in this book that the imitation of God's attributes is the highest happiness for the believer. There are three degrees in the knowledge of God, and in this respect he says:—"The virtues of the outwardly righteous are the faults of the true Saints"; by which he means that the nearer we approach to God the more perfect is our standard of character. The three degrees of knowledge are (1) intellectual, (2) that of admiration and attempted imitation, (3) that of actual acquirement of God's attributes such as the angels. Nearness to God is by rank and degree, not in regard to position or place. He quotes with approval the famous saying of Junaid:—"No one knows God save God Himself Most High, and therefore even to the best of His creatures He has only revealed His names, in which He hides Himself." He says that two statements are true in regard to God and the believer. The true believer must say always, "I know nothing but God, and, I know nothing of God."

Alas! Ghazali shows the fatal defect of Moslem ethics and the Moslem mind, for in this very chapter he uses a most degrading illustration, comparing our ignorance of God to that of an impotent man of the pleasures of coition!

His description of God's attributes is often sublime, always deeply interesting and practical and in some cases approaches very closely to the teaching of the New Testament. In speaking of God as the Merciful One he counts four mercies as supreme, namely our being by creation, our guidance, our eternal happiness, and lastly, beholding God's face in Paradise.

Each one of the ninety-nine attributes or names is described and then there follows a paragraph on how the slave of God can imitate the attribute described.

God's mercy and God's love, etc., are always active and never can be passive. His mercy and compassion exclude any suffering on His part. God allows pain and suffering for the good of His creatures, even as the cutting off of a gangrened hand may save the patient's life. But to describe the beauty of God's attributes to unbelievers is all in vain. "If thou hadst called to living ones, truly they then would hear, but who can wake the dead or bring an answer from the bier?"

Holiness is described by deprivation of all that which is merely human, not by any idea of separation from moral evil. Al-Ghazali says:—"Every attribute or description you can possibly give to the human character God is too holy to possess." The believer partakes of these attributes of holiness (of course he calls the believer the slave): (a) by freeing his mind from things temporal, visible and sensible; (b) by freeing his will from fleshly desires and passions. So that, "he does not wish anything save God and he has no pleasure save in God and he has no desire except to meet God and no joy save in nearness to God; so that even if paradise passed before him with all its delights he would not think of any of them nor be drawn to them, for the palace would only remind him of the Lord of the Palace."

Al-Ghazali was a great observer of nature and a student of the natural sciences. In his description of the Creator and the beauties of creation, both in this volume and more extensively in his "Revival of the Religious Sciences," he uses the argument of design by pointing out the wonders of the human hand, the human eye, the marvelous mysteries of embryology, the starry heavens, the wonders of the sea, and most of all man himself.

Remarkable is Ghazali's interpretation of God's name *el Ghaffar*, the One Who covers or forgives. He is called by this name because (1) He covers the shame of the body, all that which is impure and unsightly being covered by the beauty of the exterior; (2) He covers the

shame of the soul and its defects from the sight of men, so that no one can see how bad we are; (3) He covers our sins by making our good deeds atone for them on the day of resurrection. In this connection Ghazali tells a story of Jesus in these words:—"It is related concerning Jesus (on Whom be peace), that one day he passed with His disciples on the wayside and saw a dead dog, already decaying. They said to Him, 'What a stench the beast is making.' 'Nay,' said Jesus (upon Him be peace), 'What is more beautiful than his pearly teeth?' "

Throughout Ghazali's works one finds a number of references to the so-called sayings of Christ; many of them are taken from the *Hadith Kudsi*,[1] none from the Gospels directly as far as I know. In speaking of God as the Great (*Kabir*) he quotes Matthew 5: 19 incorrectly as follows:—"Therefore, Jesus (upon Him be peace) said, 'Whosoever knows and does, the same shall be called great in the Kingdom of Heaven.' "

Sometimes his remarks on the derivation of words are exceedingly beautiful; as when speaking of *el-Karim*, the Generous, he says that the vine is called *el-Karm* because it is the most friendly of trees, good in fruitage, easily to be plucked, close to the ground, without thorns and briars, so different from the lordly palm always difficult of access.

Often he puts the words of Christ upon the lips of Mohammed. For instance he says:—"The Apostle of God (upon whom be prayers and peace), when his canine tooth was broken in the battle and blood streamed down upon his face said, 'O God, direct my people for they know not what they do.' "

Of all el-Ghazali's writings none is celebrated more justly than his greatest work, "The Revival of Religious Sciences" (*Ihya ulum ud Din*). It is a veritable encyclopædia of Moslem teaching and ethics and covers the

[1] A special collection of Traditions, not the words of Mohammed but "thus saith the Lord" and not found in the Koran.

whole range of Moslem thought. Many editions of this work have been printed and commentaries written on it, the most celebrated of which is by Mohammed ez-Zubeidi el-Murtadha, in ten large volumes. The work itself consists of four volumes of ten books each and has a total of 1190 closely printed pages. Although widely read in its original form, popular demand has recently called forth an abbreviated compendium of the work entitled "An Homily for Believers" by Mohammed Jamal ud Din of Damascus. This book has all the merits and defects of an abbreviation, and is having a large circulation.

The first part of el-Ghazali's work is entitled "Things that pertain to worship"; the second part, "Things that pertain to practice"; the third part, "Things that destroy the soul," i.e. the vices; the fourth, "Things that deliver the soul," i.e. the virtues. Among "Things that pertain to worship" he treats of knowledge under seven divisions: the benefits of learning, the kind of knowledge that is forbidden and permitted, theological learning, conditions of debate and controversy, the relations of teacher and pupil, the dangers of learning, and the mind and its use. The book on dogma treats of the Moslem creed, the being and attributes of God. Then follow five books on purity (in the Moslem sense), the secrets of prayer, the secrets of almsgiving, of fasting, and of pilgrimage. The first section of his work also contains books on the perusal of the Koran, on mysticism, and on the prayer of the night-watch.

The second division might well be entitled a Treatise on Ethics. Its ten divisions deal with eating and drinking, marriage, trade, forbidden things, friendship, seclusion, journeyings, music and poetry, favors, and the ethics of true living ending with an account of the virtues of the Prophet.

So far he has chiefly followed the classification of other Moslem writers in regard to the foundations of faith and

practice in Islam. The third and fourth parts of his great work show us al-Ghazali as the mystic and the preacher of righteousness. In dealing with the "Things that destroy the soul," he describes the wonders of the human heart, the need of self-discipline, the dangers of desire, the evils of the tongue, of anger and envy, and he has a special book on despising the world, another on the use of and abuse of property and greed, a book against the love of honor and against hypocrisy, pride and the vanity of the world.

Having pointed out in his "Things that destroy the soul" the dangers that lurk in the cup of sinful pleasure as a subtle poison, he turns in the last great division of his work to the "Things that deliver the soul"—to the antidote. His ten books on this subject are entitled: On Repentance, On Patience and Thankfulness, On Fear, On Poverty and Asceticism, On the Unity of God, On Love, On Good Intent and Sincerity, On Self-examination, On Meditation, On Remembrance of Death. It would not be difficult to collect a beautiful anthology or a daily calendar of spiritual thoughts from this last section alone. A rosary of pearls from al-Ghazali's works might well be used for devotion by Christians as well as by Moslems.

Take, for example, what he says in regard to prayer. After speaking of the preliminaries to prayer, purification, etc., he deals with the mysteries of prayer first of all by stating that when the believer hears the call of the muezzin he should respond softly in his heart to each phrase used. He shows how it is more virtuous and efficacious to pray by twos or threes or in the mosque than to pray alone, basing it upon a saying of the Prophet that prayer in the mosque is worth twenty-seven times as much as private prayer. After laying great stress upon the manner of pronouncing the words and the attitude of the body, he deals with the spiritual character of prayer.

"Prayer," he says, "is a nearness to God and a gift

which we present to the King of kings even as one who comes from a distant village brings it before the ruler. And your gift is accepted of God and will be returned to you on the great day of judgment, so that you are responsible to present it as beautiful as possible." He quotes with approval a saying of Mohammed:—"True prayer is to make one's self meek and humble," and adds that the presence of the heart is the soul of true prayer and that absentmindedness destroys all its value.

"True prayer," he continues, "consists of six things: the presence of the heart, understanding, magnifying God, fear, hope, and a sense of shame." He then treats successively these elements of true prayer, showing in what they consist, how they are occasioned and how they may be secured. We secure the presence of our hearts by a deep sense of the eternal. What he says in regard to God's greatness may well be compared with such passages as the eighth Psalm, "What is man that Thou art mindful of him?" Our sense of shame is quickened, he says, by remembering our shortcomings in worship. The only way we can secure the presence of the heart in prayer is by drawing our thoughts away from outward diversions and from those within. We should not pray in the public streets for there our mind is diverted. If we can pray toward a dead wall on which there is nothing to see it will be helpful. But the inward withdrawal of the heart is still more important.

What he says about the true *kibla* is worth quoting. "It is the turning away of your outward gaze from everything save the direction of the holy house of God. Do you not then think that the turning aside of your heart from all other things to the consideration of God Most High is required of you? It certainly is. Nothing else is required of you in prayer than this, so that I would say the face of your heart must turn with the face of your body; and even as no one is able to face the house of God save by turning away from every other

direction, so the heart does not truly turn toward God save by being separated from everything else than Himself." "When you stand up to pray," he says, "remember the day when you must stand before God's throne and be judged. Be clear of hypocrisy in prayer. Do not follow those who profess to worship the face of God and at the same time seek the praise of men. . . . Flee from the devil for he is as a devouring lion. How can anyone who is pursued by a lion or an enemy who would devour him or kill him say, 'I take refuge with God from them in this castle or in this fort,' and still linger without entering the fort? Surely this will not profit him. The only way to secure protection is to change his place. In like manner whoever follows his lusts, which are the lurking place of Satan and the abomination of the Merciful, the mere saying 'I take refuge in God' will not profit. Whosoever takes his passions for a God he is under the reign of the devil and not in the safe keeping of his Lord."

He gives a long spiritual interpretation of the *Fatihah* which is beautiful. "At the conclusion of your formal prayer," he says, "offer your humble petitions and thanksgivings and expect an answer, and join in your petition your parents and the rest of true believers. And when you give the final *salaams* remember the two angels who sit on your shoulders."

In the giving of alms he says seven things are required: promptness, secrecy, example—and in this connection he quotes a Tradition ascribed to the Prophet about the left hand not knowing what the right hand doeth—absence of boasting or pride, the gift must not be spoken of as great, our best is demanded, for God is supremely good and He will only take the best, we must give our alms to the right persons, of whom he mentions six classes: the pious, the learned, the righteous, the deserving poor, those in need because of sickness or family distress, and relatives.

It is clear, however, from Ghazali's teaching that only Moslems are intended in his classification of those who may receive the *Zakat*. There is no universal brotherhood in Islam. Jews and Christians are outside of the pale, save as they have "the rights of immediate neighbours."

One of the most beautiful passages is on the proper reading of the Koran. He gives the following points: The reader must be clean outwardly and respect the book with outward reverence. He must read the proper quantity. He quotes with approval the practice of Sa'ad and Othman that the Koran should be read through once a week. One should use chanting (*tartil*), for this is helpful to the memory and makes us read slowly, for rapid reading is not approved. One should read with weeping, i.e. sorrow for sins, and should give the proper responses in the proper places, as well as use the opening prayer before beginning to read. The Koran may be read inaudibly or aloud, but it must be read "beautifully," according to the Tradition: "Adorn the Koran by the sweetness of your voice"; or another Tradition: "He who does not sing the Koran is not of our religion." One day when the Prophet heard Abu Musa reading the Koran he said, "Verily, to this reader God has given the voice of David when he wrote the Psalms."

Christians might well follow al-Ghazali's excellent advice on reading the Koran in their perusal of the Scriptures. He tells us we must regard eight things: the greatness of the revelation; the majesty of the Speaker; the need of a prepared heart; meditation; understanding the content of the passage, not twisting its meaning; we are to make the application to ourselves; and finally we must read it so that its effect may show in our lives. By the word Koran he says "we mean not the reading but the following of the teaching, for the movement of the tongue in pronouncing the words is of little value. The true reading is when the tongue and the mind and

the heart are associated. The part of the tongue is to pronounce the words clearly in chanting. The part of the mind is to interpret the meaning. The part of the heart is to translate it into life. So that the tongue chants and the mind interprets and the heart is a preacher and a warner."

Not only does he deal with the spiritual significance of outward religious observance, but he is at his best when he speaks of the inward life of the vices and their opposite virtues. No one can read his chapter against pride and boasting without seeing that he gives us here a page from his own experience. He begins by quoting the saying of the Prophet, "No one shall enter paradise in whose heart there is the weight of a grain of mustard-seed of pride." And another saying, "Said God Most High, 'Pride is my mantle and majesty is my cloak, and whosoever takes away one of them from me I will cast him into hell, and I care not.'" Another saying attributed to Mohammed is evidently taken from the Gospel: "Whoso humbleth himself before God, God will exalt him, and whosoever is proud God will bring him low." His definition of humility is beautiful: "True humility is to be subject to the truth and to be corrected by it even though thou shouldst hear it from a mere boy on the street." In this connection he quotes also a saying of Jesus: "Said the Messiah (upon Him be peace), 'Blessed is he to whom God has taught His book. He shall never die in his pride.'"

Pride is shown in different ways. Al-Ghazali enumerates pride of knowledge, of worship, of race and blood, of beauty and dress, of wealth, of bodily strength, of leadership. He gives Mohammed as an example of humility, and quotes from Abu Saeed el Khudri, who said, "O, my son, eat unto God and drink unto God and dress unto God. But whatsoever thou doest of all of these, and there enters into them pride or hypocrisy, it is disobedience. Whatever you do in your house, do it yourself

as did the Apostle of God, for he used to milk the goats and patch his sandals and sew his cloak and eat with the servants and buy in the bazaar, nor did his pride forbid him carrying his own packages home; and he was friendly to the rich and to the poor and he gave greetings himself first to every one whom he met, etc."

Humility is the crown of all the virtues to al-Ghazali, and he devotes a special chapter on how to uproot pride from the heart. In this he confesses the weakness of man to do it in his own strength but recommends that he consider his latter end, the terrors of the tomb and the return to dust "when he becomes the food of worms, so corrupt that the very animals would flee from him." His advice to the proud is *memento mori.*

The greatest chapter of his *opus magnum* is undoubtedly that on Repentance. It may well be compared with the fifty-first Psalm or the seventh chapter of St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans. That al-Ghazali himself had a deep sense of sin, no one can doubt. He was not a Pharisee but an earnest seeker after God. He teaches clearly that all the prophets, including Mohammed, were sinners, although he nowhere mentions the sinfulness of Jesus Christ.

One of the most important passages is that in which he speaks of the benefit of asking pardon. It reads as follows:—"Said Mohammed the Prophet (upon him be peace): 'Verily, I ask forgiveness of God and repent toward him every day seventy times.' " He said this, so says al-Ghazali, although God had already testified, "We have forgiven thee thy former and thy latter sins." "Said the Prophet of God, 'Truly a faintness comes over my heart until I ask God forgiveness every day one hundred times.' And said the Prophet (on him be peace), 'Whosoever says when he goes to sleep, I ask forgiveness of the Great God, than Whom there is no other, the Living, and I repent of my sins three times, God will forgive him his sins even though they were as the foam

of the seas or its sands piled up, or as the numbers of the leaves on the trees or the days of the world.' And said the Prophet of God (upon him be peace), 'Whoever says that word I will forgive his sins even though he deserts the army.' " Al-Ghazali relates a story of one Hudhifa, who said, "I was accustomed to speak sharply to my wife, and I said, 'O Apostle of God, I am afraid lest my tongue should cause me to enter the fire,' and then the Prophet of God (upon whom be peace) said, 'Where art thou in asking forgiveness compared with me, for I ask forgiveness of God every day one hundred times.' And 'Ayesha said (may God give her his favor) concerning the Prophet, 'He said to me, "If you have committed a sin ask forgiveness of God and repent to Him, for true repentance for a sin is turning away from it and asking forgiveness." And the Apostle of God (upon whom be peace) was accustomed to say when he asked for forgiveness: "O God, forgive my sin and my ignorance and my excess in what I have done, and what Thou knowest better than I do. O God, forgive me my trifling and my earnestness, my mistakes and my wrong intentions and all that I have done. O God, forgive me that which I have committed in the past and that which I will commit in the future, and what I have hidden and what I have revealed and what Thou knowest better than I do, Thou who art the first and the last and Thou art the Almighty." How different all this is from the present day superficial teaching about the sinlessness of Mohammed which is current in popular Islam.

While al-Ghazali tells this about Mohammed and his need for forgiveness he naturally deals with repentance in no superficial fashion, but as one who has tasted the bitterness of remorse and has discovered his own inability to meet the demands of even the Moslem law. His book on repentance has the following sections: (1) The reality of repentance. (2) The necessity for repentance. (3) True repentance expected by God. (4) Of what a

man should repent, namely the character of sin. (5) How small sins become great. (6) Perfect repentance, its conditions and its duration. (7) The degrees of repentance. (8) What a repentant soul does after it sins. (9) How to become truly penitent.

One can only give a summary of his teaching. He rises far above the Koran. In fact in some cases his proof texts, when we consider the context, are a terrible indictment of the Prophet. One of the texts he uses is (Surah 2, verse 222), "Verily, God loves those who repent and loves those who are purified." The context is in relation to the infamous statement "Your wives are your tillage, etc.," which many Moslem commentators interpret as a license for sodomy. No wonder that al-Ghazali was led in this very connection to begin to speak on the text "all have sinned" although he does not know St. Paul's first chapter to the Romans.

He says the necessity of repentance always and for all men is evident because no one of the human race is free from sin. "For even though in some cases he is free from outward sin of his bodily members, he is not free from sin of the heart; though free from passion he is not free from the whisperings of Satan and forgetfulness of God, or of coming short of the knowledge of God and his attributes and His works." All this is a failure of attainment and has its reasons; but if a man should forsake the causes of this forgetfulness and employ himself with the opposite virtues it would be a return to the right way; and the significance of repentance is the return. You cannot imagine that anyone of us is free from this defect, for we only differ in degrees, but the root undoubtedly exists in us.

He draws a beautiful comparison between the effects of sin on the human heart and breath upon a polished brass mirror. Of course he ignores original sin, being a good Moslem, but he makes a great deal of the effect that unrepented sin causes; how it enters deeper and

deeper into the heart until the image of God on the mirror is effaced.

Another illustration he uses is that the heart is like a goodly garment which has been dragged through filth and needs to be washed again with soap and water. "Using the heart in the exercise of our passions makes it filthy. We must therefore wash it in the water of tears and by the rubbing of repentance. It is for you to rub it clean and then God will accept it." How near and yet how far from the teaching of David and Isaiah and Paul. Did al-Ghazali ever hear some pious Jew quote Isaiah's statement that "all our righteousnesses are as filthy rags?"

He divides the sins which overcome the heart into four classes: egoistic, satanic, brutal and cruel. Under the first he puts pride, conceit, boasting, selfishness, etc.; envy, hatred, deceit, malice, corruption and unbelief, belong to the second; while greed, gluttony, lust, adultery, sodomy, theft, the robbing of orphans are classed as brutal sins; and anger, passion, abuse, cursing, murder, robbery, etc., are cruel.

Orthodox Moslems divide sins into greater and lesser. Al-Ghazali quotes a heretic who said, "There are no greater and lesser sins, but everything which is contrary to God's will is a great sin," but gives Koran passages contradicting this and then escapes the moral difficulty by showing that the smaller sins may become great if we continue in them; "like the dropping of water wearing away a stone;" and "when the servant of God reckons his sin great God reckons it small and when he reckons it small then God reckons it great."

True repentance has a two-fold result according to this Moslem theologian. Although he does not touch the deeper problem of how God can be just and yet justify the sinner, he teaches that the result of the forgiveness of our sins is that "we stand before God as though we had none," and that "we attain a higher degree of right-

eousness." The cross of Christ is the missing link in al-Ghazali's creed. He comes very close to Christianity and yet always misses the heart of its teaching. He is groping toward the light but does not grasp the hand of a friend or find a Redeemer. It is all a righteousness by works and an attainment of the knowledge of God by meditation without justification.

His final chapter on the terrors of death and hell, as well as his most pathetic account of how Mohammed the Prophet died with the fear of eternity upon him, show that God's mercy is the sinner's only hope. The revival which al-Ghazali sought and which he in some measure produced, was, as the title of his great work indicates, only a revival of religious sciences and not a quickening of dead hearts. He followed the path of the mystic to the end, but it led him into a new labyrinth, not into the light. In his autobiography he says:—"Know then, my brother (may God direct you in the right way), that the diversity in beliefs and religions, and the variety of doctrines and sects which divide men, are like a deep ocean strewn with shipwrecks, from which very few escape safe and sound. Each sect, it is true, believes itself in possession of the truth and of salvation, 'each party,' as the Koran saith, 'rejoices in its own creed'; but as the chief of the apostles, whose word is always truthful, has told us, 'My people will be divided into more than seventy sects, of whom only one will be saved.' This prediction, like all others of the Prophet, must be fulfilled."

The disciple of al-Ghazali is of all Moslems the nearest to the Gospel, and we may hope that when his works are more carefully studied and compared with the teaching of Christianity many may find in him a schoolmaster to lead them to Christ. Educated Moslems of today on the brink of agnosticism may well heed the warning with which al-Ghazali closes his "Confessions":—"The knowledge of which we speak is not derived from sources accessible to human diligence, *and that is why*

progress in mere worldly knowledge renders the sinner more hardened in his revolt against God. True knowledge, on the contrary, inspires in him who is initiate in it more fear and more reverence, and raises a barrier of defence between him and sin. He may slip and stumble, it is true, as is inevitable with one encompassed by human infirmity, but these slips and stumbles will not weaken his faith. The true Moslem succumbs occasionally to temptation, but he repents and will not persevere obstinately in the path of error. . . . I pray God the Omnipotent to place us in the ranks of His chosen, among the number of those whom He directs in the path of safety, in whom He inspires fervour lest they forget Him; whom He cleanses from all defilement, that nothing may remain in them except Himself; yea of those whom He indwells completely, that they may adore none beside Him."

CAIRO, EGYPT.

Bishop French

By Eugene Stock, D.C.L.

At the foot of the frowning and precipitous cliffs which seem to stand guard on the eastern horn of Arabia, there is a little cove with a beach, which can be reached by boat from the neighbouring Arab town of Muscat. The beach rises to a very small oasis amid the barren rocks around, in which, a few years ago, three trees might be found, and "a shrub, a kind of broom, with smooth green leaves and pink flowers." At this lonely spot are the graves of the few Christians who have died at Muscat; and on one tombstone, of white Jaipur marble with a recumbent cross, the visitor would find two texts:

"Except a corn of wheat fall into the ground and die, it abideth alone; but if it die, it bringeth forth much fruit."

"Even as the Son of Man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give His life a ransom for many."

There, just a quarter of a century ago, were laid the mortal remains of a saint of God, one whose life and character illustrated those two texts with a vividness rarely equalled, Bishop Thomas Valpy French.

He was, when death struck him, a bishop without a diocese. He had been a bishop with a diocese, but he had laid aside his high office with its power and dignities, that he might devote his closing years to seeking an entrance into the closed land of Arabia as a simple messenger from God. What was his message? The plain statement of a tremendous fact, namely, that a Divine Person had come into the world to bless all mankind with a blessing as incomparable as it was unique. It never occurred to him that Mohammedans should be excluded

from that blessing. If anyone had said to him, "Surely Islam is a good religion in its way, and suits the Arabs; why disturb them with your proselytizing?"—French would have replied with another question: "If I have good news for the whole world, must I not give all whom I can reach the chance of hearing it?" And if the rejoinder were, "It's no use: they won't receive your message," then he would have said, "Suppose they don't, I am not responsible for that; but am I not responsible to tell them?"

This is the logic of Missions. Is there anything more amazing in the world than that men who profess to be Christians can shut their eyes to it? French, at any rate, never had any doubt on the subject; he had learned it from his childhood. From the age of six or seven he was wont to mention in his prayers the names of missionaries who had visited his father's vicarage at Burton-on-Trent. At Rugby School, then in the full tide of its influence under Dr. Arnold, he would hear of the Rugbeian and Oxonian, H. W. Fox, who had dedicated himself to a missionary career in India. Like Fox, he went from Rugby to Oxford, and there, in his undergraduate days, he formed a little missionary union for study and prayer. But he was a thorough student. He obtained a first-class in "greats," along with Conington, Bright and Ince, all of whom became professors; and he subsequently won the coveted Chancellor's Latin Essay Prize, and was elected Fellow of his college.

Varied influences combined to impress upon French the personal call to himself to consecrate his academical distinctions to the cause of Christ in the mission field. Fox wrote to him from India, "If God's promises be true, the more men come out, the more men will He raise up to bless the Church with, which out of its poverty gives its best to His cause." The unrivalled eloquence of the great Bishop of Oxford, Samuel Wilberforce, in a public speech, constrained him and a college friend to pray

together that God would accept their services and fit them for the work; and when that friend was killed in a railway accident, French felt that he must at all costs fulfil the sacred purpose of both their hearts. He at once put himself in communication with the Church Missionary Society, and was enrolled as a member of its staff on April 16, 1850, in the twenty-sixth year of his age. In the same year, on Sept. 11th, he sailed for India.

Five times in his missionary career was French called, in the providence of God, to pioneer work. He started St. John's College at Agra. He founded the Derajat Mission. He established the Lahore Divinity School. He was the first Bishop of Lahore. He was the first missionary of the Cross in the Arabic State of Muscat. Three times did failure of health drive him home. Four times did he go back to "the Front."

I. Agra was already an interesting place when French went there, not merely for its historic associations and for the far-famed Taj, but for the missionary work of which it had been the scene. One of Carey's Baptist colleagues had been invited thither in 1811 to be the tutor of an officer's children, but he was at once sent back to Serampore (which, being a Danish settlement, did not acknowledge the regulations of the East India Company), —Lord Hastings saying that "one might fire a pistol into a powder-magazine, and it might not explode, but no wise man would hazard the experiment." So it fell out that before any missionary from the Western world had begun work so far up the Gangetic Valley, the Gospel was first preached in Hindustani at Agra by an Indian Christian, under the auspices of the British chaplain there, Daniel Corrie, afterwards first Bishop of Madras. This Indian, Sheikh Salih, had been a Mohammedan, and a high official at the Moslem court of the then independent State of Oudh. He had been led to Christ under the preaching of Henry Martyn, who also was a chaplain and not in the technical sense a missionary; and he had been baptized

at Calcutta by the new name of Abdul Masih (Servant of Christ). There was a Corresponding Committee of the Church Missionary Society at Calcutta, although British Bengal was still closed to missionaries, and that committee used a grant of money remitted by the Society to engage Abdul Masih as a Christian teacher. He worked at Agra several years, and brought in some fifty converts for baptism. He was afterwwards ordained by Bishop Heber.

Then three German missionaries of the Basle Society, who had been expelled from North-West Persia when the Russians conquered the territory they had worked in, and who had made their way to India (which was then open), had been engaged by the C.M.S. Corresponding Committee and stationed at Agra. One of these, Carl Pfander, was perhaps the ablest of all missionaries to Mohammedans, and his books, translated into three or four languages, are used in Moslem Missions to this day. Several conversions of learned Mohammedans were due under God to his influence and writings.

But French's work was different. The success of Dr. Alexander Duff's College at Calcutta had opened the eyes of missionary leaders to the importance of Higher Education on Christian principles as an evangelistic agency among the upper classes of India; and the Church Missionary Society was being urged by sympathetic British officials,—particularly by Mr. James Thomason, the Lieutenant-Governor of the North-West Provinces (then so called)—to open a similar college at Agra. Thomason, says Sir R. Temple, "was one of the most successful Englishmen that have ever borne rule in India"; and under him were trained some of the greatest and most fearlessly Christian of these rulers, such as John Lawrence, Robert Montgomery, Donald McLeod, and William Muir. He and his friends raised a large fund on the spot to start the scheme; and French's offer to the Society came in the nick of time to provide the right men for such a work. St. John's College was the result—so

named after Henry Martyn's college at Cambridge, "with additional reference" (wrote French) "to St. John as the Apostle of Oriental Churches."

There was already a large Government college in the city; but from that institution the Bible was excluded, and intelligent Indian parents of a superior class, though they had of course no wish for their sons to become Christians—and indeed no fear of their doing so, —did wish them to learn truthfulness and honesty and the moral virtues generally; and they soon found that Christian teaching could in this respect do what secular teaching could not. But French aimed at conversions, and, as elsewhere, conversions came in due course, in answer to prayer and by the power of Divine grace. Few, indeed, during the actual school period. Pupils under sixteen were not allowed by Government to change their religion without the consent of their parents; and older students, even when convinced of the truth of Christianity, shrank naturally from the consequences of baptism, the loss of home and of all things they most valued. But the Divine message does not fail. The truths learned at school and college come back with fresh force under other influences in after years; and, as a matter of fact, the great majority of the upper-class converts in India have come from those who were once students in Christian colleges. This is the general experience, and it has been the experience of St. John's, Agra. There have been Indian clergymen of influence who owed their Christianity to the teaching of French and his colleagues and successors. French declared that his hope was to raise up some of the Timothys and Tituses of India; and the God Whose Message he faithfully delivered did not suffer him to be disappointed. "One soweth, and another reapeth."

It was while French was at Agra that the great Mutiny of 1857 took place. While highly paid native officials deserted to the enemy, his students, Hindu or Mohammedan

though they might be, stayed where they were; and when the city had to be abandoned, and all retired to the Fort, they still proved trusty friends. It was then that a body of native Christians from a neighbouring village were refused admittance, until French insisted on going out and sharing their fate, whereupon the gate was opened for them.

After eight years of incessant labour French was ordered home by the doctors; and thus was completed his first pioneer service. The College has maintained its position ever since, and recently has been greatly enlarged and developed. Many men of academical distinction from Oxford and Cambridge have given some of the best years of their lives to its work; and today it is recognized as one of the leading institutions in India.

II. When French returned to India, he undertook an entirely different task, but a still more definitely pioneer service. He went further northeast to the great province of the Punjab. It had only been British territory twelve years, but it was already occupied as a mission field both by the American Presbyterians and by the Church Missionary Society, under the direct auspices of the Christian men to whose administration it had been committed, the Lawrences, Montgomery and others, who carried thither the teaching and example of Thomason, under whom (as we have seen) several of them had been trained. These men were strictly loyal to the just official neutrality of the Government, but they knew well that Hindus and Moslems alike accord special confidence and respect to rulers who are not ashamed of their own religion, and who desire to see it spreading in legitimate ways. Even beyond the Indus, one city, the great military station Peshawar, was already occupied by the Church Missionary Society, with the express sanction of the like-minded Commissioner there, Sir Herbert Edwardes, the brilliant soldier who is the hero of Ruskin's *A Knight's Faith*. And now came another invitation, from another Christian administrator, Colonel Reynell Taylor,

the Commissioner of a territory called the Derajat, between the Indus and the Afghan mountain ranges. Into that territory debouch the passes by which trading caravans bring the produce of Central Asia down on to the plains of India.

No missionary had yet entered that district, and thither went Valpy French, to carry the Divine Message to the wild frontier tribes, Mohammedans of a bigoted type. With a view to conciliating their prejudices he, against his own taste, grew a beard, finding that "they measured a man as much by his beard as by his brains"; and he lived as much as possible among the people, avoiding the military posts, where the British officers, unlike the Commissioner, had no welcome for a missionary. He found, in fact, the Moslem mullahs claiming to be more religious than the English. "They only worship God once a week, and then they don't kneel down to worship Him!" But his ascetic life and utter self-sacrifice soon brought his enterprise to an end. After a few months, he was found by a military doctor insensible in the jungle from congestion of the brain, and was, he was told, "snatched from the jaws of death," with no hope for him but in leaving by the first steamer for England. "With severe remedies," he wrote, "my reason returned. I suppose the sun and fatigue had injured it. Afterwards I had a bad attack of dysentery, but rallied from this, though I am at the *ne plus ultra* of debility."

But French's departure did not close the new Mission. Robert Bruce and others carried on the work zealously, and there were notable converts. In later years Medical Missions have gained great influence over the wild tribesmen. One hospital, worked by an Indian doctor, was the only building spared when murderous raiders attacked the town of Tank; and the late Dr. Pennell's splendid mission has become widely known, commended as it was by his cousin, Lord Roberts.

III. French's third pioneer work was more like his first,

for it was again the principalship of a college. But a different college from St. John's, Agra. That was mainly for non-Christians, with evangelistic purpose. This was for the training of picked men among Indian Christians for work as pastors and teachers and evangelists. The Punjab Mission had now so far progressed that such an institution was called for; and French, after a few years in home parishes, undertook to start it. One of his closest friends, Dr. Kay, who had been Principal of Bishop's College, Calcutta, declared that after French's previous experience, he "ought not" to go out again; but Robert Clark, the senior C.M.S. missionary in the Punjab—a Cambridge wrangler who laboured there half a century—said, "If those who ought to go won't, then those who *ought not must!*" French himself had no hesitation. He never had. He submitted to the dispensations of God's providence when illness drove him home, but always there was in him the full purpose of going out again whenever a fresh call should come. On one of the tombs in Exeter Cathedral there is a motto, "This man put his hand to the plough, and never looked back"; and that motto French quoted when taking leave of the C.M.S. Committee the second time, as indicating the pattern he desired to follow. To his wife, on that same occasion, he wrote, "I trust the sacrifice we thus make of some of life's happiest years, the years when joy is intensest, may be graciously accepted for His sake Who alone can put any worth into our poor maimed offerings." And now, at the third leave-taking, he referred to a Roman soldier mentioned by Livy, who after twenty campaigns, was going forth to war again, and who said, "I have eight children, and might claim exemption, but I shall always be ready to go against my country's foes, when my Imperator calls me." A particularly apt reference, for French himself was leaving behind exactly the same number of children. But "exemption"!—no, that was the last thing he would have thought of!

A remarkable colleague now appeared to go with him. John W. Knott, Fellow of Brasenose, had been an ardent disciple of Dr. Pusey, and had been sent by him to Leeds to take charge of the church which Pusey had built at his own cost as a centre for the north of England of what were regarded as advanced "High Church" teachings. Within six years of its consecration, nine out of fifteen clergymen connected with it had seceded to the Church of Rome; and Knott had been sent to retrieve the position. He, however, had seceded in his turn; not, indeed, from the Anglican Church, but from that section of it of which Pusey was a leader. This was the man who now offered to work with and under French in the new divinity college; but in the mysterious providence of God he was not permitted even to begin. Before the college was opened, he fell a victim to the fever of the Peshawar Valley, where he was ministering to the British troops.

Lahore, the capital of the Punjab, was fixed on for the new institution; and it was opened in 1870. French began with no flourish of trumpets; indeed his personal experience on arriving at Lahore was typical of his spirit. There was no one at the railway station to receive him, so he took his baggage himself in a hand-barrow to the "dâk bungalow" and found a sofa to pass the night on, —"beginning," as he said, his new life "in an inn, according to the best precedent that could be followed." But this simplicity did not extend to his proposed curriculum. The Hebrew Old Testament, the Greek Septuagint and New Testament, the Greek and Latin Fathers, were to be studied; and this through the medium, not of English, but of the vernacular Urdu. That is to say, the students were to read (say) Ezekiel in Hebrew and Ephesians in Greek, and French and his helpers were to lecture on these books in Urdu, with occasional use of Persian, Pushtu, Punjabi, Sanskrit, and Arabic; while Chrysostom and Augustine, Dörner and Tholuck, Hooker and Owen, were to be laid under contribution. He said, "A

Mohammedan convert, brought up all his life in distaste of and prejudice against English, should find that his want of English does not disqualify him for perfecting his curriculum of theology. Christianity should be domesticated on the Indian soil." Obviously, there would not be many Indian Christians who could respond to such a course of teaching; but French sought for quality and not for quantity. Ten or twelve men quite sufficed for a beginning; and they came from all parts of North India. Some were baptized Christians from infancy, being children of converts; some were the fruit of mission schools; some had found Christ in later life. Although the majority were Anglicans, others were not excluded. All were welcome, but on one condition—they must wear Indian dress. Once a native catechist in European garb applied for admission, and French let him in for a week, hoping he would conform, but on his refusal he was sent away.

French had the joy of seeing several of his men in definite posts of missionary service before he was again compelled to leave India. The first two to be ordained (by the Bishop of Calcutta) were (1) Imam Shah, who had been a bigoted Mohammedan and was first struck by the words "Our Father" applied to God—so strange a phrase to Moslem ears,—and who has now been forty years pastor of the native congregation at Peshawar; (2) John Williams, a descendant of a native Roman Catholic family, and the doctor before alluded to at the frontier hospital at Tank spared by the Afghan raiders. At last French utterly broke down. "Today," he presently wrote, "I have wound up my watch for the first time for seven weeks, and knelt down for the first time. My heart, I trust, has often knelt, but not my knees." So, once more, he returned home. But his college has continued its useful career for five and forty years.

IV. Thus three times had Valpy French broken down in India. But apparently his physical strength increased

with advancing age, and when the fourth pioneer service was pressed upon him, he was able to give it ten years of untiring labour. This was the Bishopric of Lahore. Up to that time the whole of North India was in the diocese of Calcutta, a bishopric specially honoured by the fact that every one of the seven bishops who had held it died in India. An episcopal see in the Punjab was therefore a novelty, and in fact proved to be the pioneer of the great extension of diocesan organization which has marked later years. When the Archbishop of Canterbury (Dr. Tait) proposed the new post to French, the latter at once refused it, unless the Government would disclaim any idea of restricting or impeding the missionary work among the non-Christian population which was ever first in his thoughts and sympathies. Happily this condition did not prevent the formal offer coming to him in the name of the Queen; and French was consecrated at Westminster Abbey on St. Thomas's Day, Dec. 21, 1877. His old friend Dr. Kay preached the sermon, on the last two verses of the Acts; and the closing words of the text, "no man forbidding him," came with special appropriateness in view of that condition.

The diocese of Lahore extends from Karachi to the Himalayas, and from Delhi to the Afghan Frontier, and is a sufficiently arduous post even apart from the Church's missionary work; for the large British military forces are themselves an important and most interesting sphere of labour, and the British civilians are not few. Bishop French planned at once to build a cathedral at Lahore, and for that purpose toiled persistently in raising funds, besides devoting to it one half of his episcopal stipend, and cutting down all possible expense in order to do so. The Anglican Church service at Lahore had so far been held in an old building which had been erected as a tomb for a dancing girl. "In the midst of an architectural people," wrote French, "and most self-sacrificing in what they spend on buildings for sacred purposes, it is a scandal

that we should worship in a tomb belonging to a Mohammedan past." At length, in the tenth and last year of his episcopate, he was able to consecrate the church, on Jan. 25, 1887,—a suitable day as the feast in the Church calendar of the Conversion of St. Paul. He had resolutely insisted that Indian Christians had an equal right to the cathedral with the English worshippers, and he would not allow any symbol or ornament in it that could "offend the Mohammedan's horror of images, or foster superstition in any recent convert from a base idolatry." On the consecration day, one aisle was reserved for Indian Christians, the other aisle being allotted to British soldiers, while the general civilian congregation occupied the nave. The English service was followed by an Urdu service, at which the Rev. Dr. Imad-ud-din preached, and the Rev. Mian Sadiq Masih read one of the Lessons.

By his untiring labour and self-sacrifice, and by his generous appreciation of the different schools of thought in the Church, French set an example which his three successors in the see, Bishops Matthew and Lefroy and Durrant, have faithfully followed. But he could not carry this his fourth burden more than ten years, and on Dec. 22, 1887, he surrendered the bishopric. It may be doubted whether he was ever quite happy in that high and holy service. Some of his difficulties will be referred to presently, but it was not on their account that he was ready to retire. He well knew how to cast all such burdens on the Lord. But what he did shrink from was the unavoidable measure of state attaching to his office. An anglican bishop in India cannot escape from this, however simple-hearted he may be. He is a high dignitary of the ruling race, and cannot help himself. Several good men in that position have fretted about it. French certainly did. And to him the day of his retirement was a happy day. Not, however, that he was hoping for a dignified rest at home. A missionary he was, and a missionary he would be to the end.

V. Two feelings now inspired him. First, his heart yearned over the Mohammedans; second, his sympathies, as befitted one who was steeped in Church history, were deeply engaged for the ancient Churches which have so steadfastly maintained their Christian faith through centuries of Moslem domination, though they have not been, as they should have tried to be, the evangelists of their oppressors. Naturally, therefore, his eyes turned to Western Asia.

Even before his retirement from the see of Lahore, he had begun the travels and missionary services in those Moslem lands on which his heart was set. Once during his episcopate he visited England, and in doing so he took Persia *en route*. It was with deep feeling that he entered the country of Cyrus and Queen Esther, and recalled the memorable sojourn there of Henry Martyn in 1812. At Shiraz, the city where Martyn suffered so acutely from the reproaches and blasphemies of the mullahs, French was welcomed by them, and was able in many conversations to witness for the truth of God. He also confirmed sixty-seven candidates from the congregation gathered by the C.M.S. Mission under Dr. Bruce at Julfa, and ordained a native pastor.

But it was when at length free from diocesan responsibilities that Bishop French put his design into fuller execution. On leaving Lahore, he did not sail for England, but spent more than a year in Mesopotamia and Syria, travelling from place to place, braving heat and cold, dust and damp, if thereby he might get into touch with Moslems, Jews and Oriental Christians in their actual daily life. He found abundant opportunities of useful intercourse with Nestorian and Armenian and Jacobite and Greek ecclesiastics, with American Presbyterian missionaries, and with Mohammedans of both Turkish and Arab race. At last he came to Palestine, spent the Christmas of 1888 at Bethlehem, and thence returned to England for the last time.

Then, hungering for a fifth pioneer work, and still drawn in heart to the Near East, he was struck by an article in the *Church Missionary Intelligencer* of January, 1889, by Alexander Mackay of Uganda, entitled *Muscat, Zanzibar, and Central Africa.* Zanzibar had been up to about that time a dependency of the Sultan of Oman, in Eastern Arabia, whose capital was Muscat. From Muscat came many of the Mohammedan traders who so vehemently opposed Mackay's work and influence in Uganda; and they used to say to him, "Ah, you come and convert the Uganda people, who are idol-worshippers; you never tried to convert us at Muscat!" Mackay, with his usual far-seeing statesmanship, urged in his article that Moslem influence should be attacked at its headquarters by the establishment of a Mission at Muscat; and the idea occurred to Bishop French of going there himself to start such a Mission. It was an heroic venture for a man of sixty-five, already strained with much travelling and study and labour; but French was of the stuff of which heroes are made.

But he was no mere restless wanderer. For every work that he undertook he made conscientious preparation; and realizing the importance of greater facility in colloquial Arabic, he first visited Tunis and Egypt. Then, in order to get to Muscat, he must needs go to Bombay; but instead of taking the regular P. and O. liner, he sailed from Suez in a Turkish coasting vessel that was going to the various ports on both sides of the Red Sea. Thus he eventually reached Aden, then Bombay, then Karachi; and there he found a small Persian Gulf steamer going to Muscat,—"the chief advantage of it," he said, "being that I hear Arabic spoken incessantly." On Feb. 21, 1891, he at last landed at Muscat.

At this famous Arab commercial port there was a British Political Agent, Colonel Mockler, who would gladly have taken the Bishop into his house. But French wished neither to compromise the Government of India

by his missionary proceedings nor to give ground for any prejudice against him on the part of the Arabs as representing a foreign power. So he hired a dirty room in a Portuguese grog-shop until better quarters were found for him by the American Consul. Of trivialities of this sort, however, he cared little, and wrote less; but he immediately began a full journal of his intercourse with the people. Let some brief extracts be here given:—

"Muscat is full of mosques, and they are fairly well attended by women as well as men, more so than in any other Mohammedan city I have seen."

"Two days ago, a large party of Arabs (ladies and gentlemen, the former standing, the latter sitting) made almost a dead set at me to induce me to turn Mohammedan. It was a new experience to me, but useful as enabling me better to understand the feeling an Arab or Hindu would have in being so approached with a view to changing a faith dear to him as life itself, and so with the Moslems it usually is."

"Happily we have the promise for Arabia twice repeated by name in the seventy-second Psalm (Prayer-book Version). Was it that which took St. Paul so soon into Arabia?"

"Beyond all my expectations I am permitted to witness here to companies of educated and thoughtful Arab sheikhs and their followers. Last evening I sat an hour in a circle of them, going through many of the most vital Gospel truths, and listened to with marked attention and seriousness. . . . I began by speaking of the coming Kingdom of God and Christ, reading David's words in II Sam. 23. Then, from Isaiah 35 and Psalm 72, I showed some of the characteristic features of this kingdom, and how the kings of Arabia and Seba should bring gifts. Then the way was open for further reference to the kingdom of Christ as set up in the heart. . . . Many questions they asked as to prayers and pilgrimages; what I thought of Mohammed and the Koran; what would become of the fornicator and drunkard in the coming Kingdom; in answer to which I read much of Rev. 21 and 22, which seemed to strike them much."

"I long for the prayers of your little band of intercessors, offering this simple request, that as the Arab has been so grievously a successful instrument in deposing Christ from His throne (for this long season only), in so many fair regions of the East . . . so the Arab may be at least one of the main auxiliaries in restoring the Great King and reseating Him on God's throne of righteousness."

Meanwhile he was making inquiries as to the feasibility of a journey into the interior, and at last found an Arab who seemed an earnest inquirer, and who was willing to go with him. He wrote to the present writer, summarizing his work and prospects, and adding, with reference to the

Arab, "I have sung my *Te Deum* for him." At last he started in an open boat for Sib, a village some thirty miles distant, whence the journey inland could be conveniently attempted. But it was not to be. He was already weakened by fever, and at Sib he broke down altogether. He was carried back to Muscat, quickly sank, and entered into rest on May 14, 1891. The last offices were performed by Christians, Goanese Roman Catholics who had heard of him; and their whole small community attended the funeral. The coffin was covered with the British flag, and the service was read by Colonel Mockler.

Such, compressed into a few paragraphs, were the five periods of Thomas Valpy French's missionary career. It remains to point out some of the characteristics of the man.

1. He was always a student. The present writer once met him at a railway junction in the north of England, on his way to a country rectory for one night. He had fifteen or twenty packages with him, not to add to his personal comfort—the last thing he would think of—but because he could not bear to be separated from his books. But he did not want to burden others with them. A rector with whom he stayed wrote, "When he arrived, before he could be hindered, he had plunged half way upstairs with a heavy bag of books, saying he would not break the housemaid's back with it." Even when travelling in countries like Mesopotamia, he must needs take with him what he himself described as "a small representative library of all sorts of books almost, except high mathematics and novels!" His biographer notes down the books which he not only read but from which he made extracts in his diary within a few months—just as they come, without any definite order; Homer, Chrysostom, Charles of Bala, Gerlach, Charnock, Hugh Macmillan, Life of Lacordaire, McCheyne, Pusey, Carlyle, Milton, Adolphe Monod, Hengstenberg, Carter of Clewer, Spen-

ser's Faerie Queene, Livy, Propertius, Burke, Bunsen, Niebuhr, Bengel, Berridge, Fletcher of Madeley. With a view to his lectures at the Lahore Divinity School he read afresh many of the Early Fathers, and, among more modern writers, Hooker and Owen and Butler, Dörner and Martensen and Liddon. Many hours he found sometimes were required for the preparation of one lecture:—

"With the Mohammedans dogging our steps and scenting out every real and imaginary difficulty, we cannot do as we would and confine ourselves wholly to the spiritual interpretation. The critical will have its place. . . . Then, to put it all into intelligible and expressive Hindustani involves further torture of the brain and culling of technical words from Arabic and Persian text-books, the Sufi literature, the Vedant and other philosophic systems of the Hindus."

Still more significant was his advice to a young missionary—advice worthy of one who came to be called "the seven-tongued man":—

"You must of course commence with Urdu or Hindustani, so as to be able to talk with your servants, to help in the services of the church and in the schools. You had better give some six or seven hours a day to that, and also spend two or three hours at Punjabi, to be able to talk with villagers. You should also try to give two or three hours to the study of Persian, which you will find invaluable in the schools, and all your spare time to Arabic, so as to be able to read the Quran."

But all was subordinate to the Bible itself. Of his Indian divinity students he wrote,—

"Between our Greek and Hebrew lectures . . . we manage various parts of the Old and New Testament. It is delightful to witness the beaming countenances. They thoroughly realize the text, 'I am as glad of Thy word as one that findeth great spoil.'"

2. As a preacher he was always the scholar, but far indeed from the dry-as-dust book-worm. He aimed at the heart and conscience. There was one class of hearers in India that disliked him—the worldly English folk. They would, he said, listen with indifference to doctrinal preaching, and "sleep it out"; "justification, etc., what care they about such things?" "But they do resent being preached to about conversion, and that the friendship of the world is enmity with God." "I preached a solemn

sermon on the duty of Society and the Church with reference to adulterers in our midst; and Mrs. ——— called it an Athanasian kind of sermon." But Christ was the centre of all his teaching.—

"Easter Day, 1879.—This morning a wonderful congregation of native Christians—some two hundred, of whom seventy-five were confirmed yesterday, and over one hundred and sixty were present at the Lord's Table this morning. I dwelt, in Hindustani, on the destruction of Pharaoh's host in the Red Sea as the type of the open tomb of the Lord Jesus, round about which are strewn the corpses of the forgiven, obliterated, and subdued sins of His people, as set forth in Micah 7 and Rev. 15."

"Dec. 26, 1886.—I took, after long preparation, a new text, Isaiah 28:5, 6, trying to show how in spite of all the lowliness of the manger of Bethlehem, Christ Incarnate had been seen by His saints in all ages as "the crown of glory and diadem of beauty"—by St. Stephen, by St. Paul before Nero, by Bishop Hannington and his fellow-martyrs in Uganda, by many in high and low places, as St. Louis IX, Elizabeth of Hungary, Alfred the Great."

It was, however, not his sermons that gave him influence with the British soldiers. His biographer confesses that "he might sometimes weary the patience of the soldier in that hot Indian climate by the length of his discourse, or shoot above the heads of all but the more thoughtful of his hearers." "But every soldier could appreciate his manifest sincerity, and when he went miles out of his way in the burning sun to minister to two or three in their sickness, or stripped off his coat in hospital to rub the limbs of some poor fellow writhing with pains of cholera, they recognized that in their own chief pastor they had one who understood their troubles, and was ever ready to endure hardness as a good soldier of Jesus Christ." He took the total abstinence pledge despite his "often infirmities," as an example and encouragement to them. An aide-de-camp at Lahore testified to his influence with "fine young fellows, plucky, honourable, and straight," who found that "his big chivalrous heart made them feel better men," and ready to "do their round of parade or stables or whatever came to their hand with a keener sense of duty."

3. Ecclesiastically, Bishop French stood aloof from all Church parties. His childhood had been passed in an Evangelical home of the beautiful old type which so many writers not themselves identified with Evangelical views —Mr. G. W. E. Russell notably—have loved to describe; and his Oxford life, which coincided with the later Newman period, did not move him from his early faith. So much so that when responding to the missionary call he quite naturally joined the Church Missionary Society; and all his life he loved the Society and admired its work. But he could not identify himself with the views and policy of some of its members and missionaries. "It is evangelical truth," he wrote in 1867, "that I stickle for. The party, as a party, I never fight for; its Church views I don't agree with." Again, "In Church views . . . constitutionally and by experience, as well as by study of facts, I am a High Churchman." His historic instinct, his imaginative mind, his love of symbolism, his keen appreciation of patristic and mediaeval writings, his strong view of episcopal authority, all combined to influence him in that direction. He defended, and practised, Evening Communion; but he always took the Eastward Position. He "satisfied himself, from Hooker, and words in the Service for the Sick and Holy Communion offices, that, within reasonable limits, it was the duty of the Church of England to recognize the hearing of confessions as part of the ministerial function," while he condemned the Roman practice:—

> "A ministry whose principle it is that the Christian shepherd is beyond all else the father-confessor of his people, though it gratifies the love of power, and fastens silken chains round hearts naturally reverential and dependent, feeble and loving to shake off responsibility, yet does not in the end foster robustness and solidity of Christian character, nor cultivate the best and purest and strongest types of Christian manhood and womanhood."

He invited Anglican "Sisters" to his diocese; yet he translated Spurgeon's sermons, and notices of Moody's

meetings, into Hindustani. He wrote to Robert Clark, the senior C. M. S. missionary before mentioned, "If *the mother* (the Church) and *the daughter* (the C. M. S.) disagree, I must be forgiven for taking the mother's side! But it is sometimes not so much *the daughter* as *the daughter's sons!*" And again: "My last sigh and pang of agony will be for the miserable small and frivolous strifes which fritter away our strength." But when his brother bishops in India issued a certain manifesto resting the claims of the Church of England on Apostolical Order only, he declined to sign it, urging that they had "a threefold base, Evangelical Truth, Apostolic Order, and Working Power and Usefulness."

When he travelled in Syria and Mesopotamia, and was asked what sort of Christian he called himself, his reply was "Katulik la Papaviya" (Catholic, not Papal), because the Roman Catholics everywhere pronounced all, Eastern or Western, who did not submit to the Papacy, "uncatholic." Yet even the Romans in some places gave him a courteous reception; at Bagdad, for instance, the Carmelite nuns invited him to examine their school-girls. Always himself on the look-out for heroes, he made a journey to the tomb of Père Besson, a famous Dominican missionary who had been Pio Nono's chief painter at the Vatican, and whom French described as "a kind of Henry Martyn of the Roman Church." His general desire for fellowship with all Christians may be illustrated by the incidents of one Sunday at Mosul. First, he "attended Jacobite mass." "The prayers seemed full of Christ; the Virgin's name I caught once or twice, but not the connexion in which it came. I begged to receive the elements kneeling, and both were brought to me by the officiating priest." At noon he was present at a Bible class of the American Presbyterians, and "said a few words." In the afternoon he "attended a service of prayer and song in the fine Latin cathedral of the Dominicans." In the evening he "attended the American ser-

vice." He confessed that he had begun his tour in those lands with some prejudice against the American Presbyterians, whom he regarded as representing a policy of proselytizing from the ancient Churches; but in a long letter to Archbishop Benson he said that he "found witness borne on all hands to the remarkable stirring and awakening which their schools and public services and ministries, with the large circulation of the Holy Scriptures, had brought about among several of the Churches of the East." In India he had found the American Presbyterian missionaries among his best friends, having intimate fellowship with men like Newton and Forman, the distinguished heads of their Mission in the Punjab.

4. But above all things French was an ardent missionary. Even during his episcopate, his greatest happiness was to get away from state and social functions, and to go preaching in the frontier mountain-valleys or in the villages of the plains. When he was Principal of the Divinity School, he led his students regularly in evangelistic tours. When he went up to Quetta, the most advanced post of the British occupation, to minister to the troops, he eagerly seized the opportunity to spend hours in the Afghan fruit-market talking to the traders about Christ. He translated and copied out Isaiah 53 for them to take home. The hot season, in the hills, he sometimes gave to linguistic work, notably the revision of the Urdu Prayer-book, assisted by two C. M. S. men from Oxford and by the Revs. Tara Chand and Imad-ud-din; also of parts of both the Old and New Testaments in Pushtu, the Afghan language. He frequently visited the various Missions; the C. M. S. work at Amritsar and Peshawar, and the S. P. G. work at Delhi, especially commanding his interest and sympathy. The Cambridge Delhi Mission, indeed, formed under the auspices of Lightfoot and Westcott, was in fact originally an idea of his own. He rejoiced when its first Head, Edward Bickersteth, was sent as bishop to Japan; but he did not live to see its

second Head, G. A. Lefroy, appointed third bishop of his own diocese (and now Metropolitan of India).

And when in England he was always the keenest of missionary advocates. He would gladly take long journeys to plead for the S. P. G. or C. M. S.; and he warmly supported Archbishop Benson's scheme for a Central Board of Missions. He twice read valuable papers before the Church Congress. He preached before both the two great Universities, and spoke at Canon Christopher's famous Missionary Breakfast at Oxford; and his sermon at the C. M. S. anniversary in 1884, which occupied an hour and a quarter, was one of his greatest efforts. He was particularly interested in Uganda, and rejoiced to join in the laying on of hands when Bishop Tucker was consecrated. Indeed in India, and even during his Syrian tours, he gave several lectures on the Uganda Mission and Bishop Hannington. Some years earlier, while he was temporarily rector of St. Ebbe's at Oxford, he inspired a group of young graduates and undergraduates to form a little society of Oxford Missionary Associates; and from that band came at least three future bishops, Mylne of Bombay, Poole of Japan, and Hodges of Travancore, and other missionaries in Africa and India and China.

5. One object of Missions particularly appealed to French, the organization of the "native Church." Not that he looked for a separate Church composed of "native" converts only. He was a thorough believer in the Church Catholic as uniting all races. One Church for India was his ideal. But he desired to see it free to assume an Oriental character, to avoid undue "westernization," and above all not to be mixed up with the controversies that so unhappily divide us at home. He was even disposed, like some other bishops in India—and unlike those in Africa—to relax somewhat the rule that no polygamist can be baptized. Naturally it was his great joy to add to the number of the Indian clergy; and he was himself privileged to ordain eleven. One of these had been a

learned Sikh pundit, "steeped in Sanskrit, Vedic, and other philosophic lore, and a man of family and influence and authority with Government." "I stayed a few hours with him at his own village, and partook of his milk and chupaties." Kharak Singh—that was his name—in his turn visited the bishop, and when he obviously did not know how to use his knife on the leg of a fowl, "I took up mine with my fingers, and begged him not to mind doing it, as I didn't." With the most conspicuous of the Indian clergy, Imad-ud-din, French had a close friendship; and he counted it a high privilege to invest the learned ex-Mohammedan moulvie with the Lambeth degree of D.D., conferred on him by Archbishop Benson. In the address on the occasion French said,—

"It is not as a mark of honour that this title is bestowed, but as a symbol of brotherly love and as a pledge of fellowship between the Churches of England and India, or rather to signify that if British and Hindu are two in race, in the Church they are one; not that one branch should be in bondage to the other, but that by the grace of God they should be perfectly joined together."

Bishop French's career has never touched the popular imagination like those of Selwyn and Patteson, Mackenzie and Steere, Hannington and Tucker. But his real greatness was fully appreciated by the men of light and leading who could form a juster judgment. When he went to start the Divinity School, Dr. Lightfoot (afterwards Bishop of Durham) and Dr. John Wordsworth (afterwards Bishop of Salisbury) collected contributions from Oxford men, and Dr. Westcott (who succeeded Lightfoot at Durham) from Cambridge men. Dr. Lightfoot, at an annual meeting of the S. P. G., spoke of "the noble letters sent by Mr. French to the Church Missionary Society." When he became bishop, Westcott wrote of the "joy and confident hope" such an appointment inspired. "We seem," he said, "to see the great thoughts of the Divinity School become the inspiring thoughts of a diocese, and so, if God will, the solid foundation of a true Indian Church." When he resigned the bishopric Arch-

bishop Benson wrote, "Your very presence at Lahore has lifted, and daily lifts, the mission cause into its true position for the very first time"; and on the very day, May 5, 1891, when French was starting from Muscat in that open boat for the place whence he hoped to pierce the interior of Arabia, Dr. Benson, at the C. M. S. annual meeting, uttered a warm eulogy on him, unconscious that within nine days French would be called into the presence of his Lord.

When the news of his death reached England, Archdeacon A. E. Moule, the veteran China missionary, commemorated him in a fine poem, the first verse of which runs thus:—

> Where Muscat fronts the Orient sun
> 'Twixt heaving sea and rocky steep,
> His work of mercy scarce begun,
> A saintly soul has fallen asleep:
> Who comes to lift the Cross instead?
> Who takes the standard from the dead?

The response to this challenge was given before the challenge appeared. In that very Turkish steamer which had conveyed the Bishop from port to port in the Red Sea there was another missionary pioneer aiming at Eastern Arabia—Samuel W. Zwemer, of the American (Dutch) Reformed Church. French took possession of the land by laying his weary body under the cliffs at Muscat. Zwemer took possession of it, in the happy providence of God, by living and working on that wild coast many years, establishing a permanent and important Mission. Dr. Zwemer is now known all over the world as one of the very first authorities on Islam and Missions to Mohammedans. His work now at Cairo is of the highest value. His quarterly review, *The Moslem World*, is read with keen interest in Europe and America. He has done more than any other man to remind Christendom that the Divine Message of the Gospel is for Mohammedans as much as for the rest of mankind.

In another direction Bishop French's work was for

many years carried on by a veteran like himself. When he went to India on his first pioneer service in 1850, he was accompanied by a young graduate of Dublin University, Edward Craig Stuart. After a quarter of a century of excellent service in India, Stuart went to New Zealand, and joined the C. M. S. Maori Mission. Presently he was elected by the diocese of Waiapu to be its second bishop, and he was actually consecrated there in December, 1877, ten days before French was consecrated bishop in Westminster Abbey. Fifteen years of exemplary work as a missionary bishop passed away, and then he was visited by a friend from England sent out to stir up the Australians and New Zealanders to take a share in the evangelization of Africa and Asia—the writer of this present article. To him Bishop Stuart opened his heart: should he not follow his old comrade's example, give up his bishopric, and go as a simple missionary to some Mohammedan land? A letter from Persia decided him, and in 1894 he resigned his see, and dedicated himself to the work of preaching the Gospel in that same country of Cyrus and Queen Esther where French had done temporary service ten years before. There, with short intervals, he was permitted by the grace of God to labour fifteen years; but not, like French, to lay his bones in the field of his service, for in his eighty-fourth year he was brought to England to die, and entered into rest on March 15, 1911, eighteen years after the brother with whom he had started his missionary career sixty years before. Is there any case quite like this in all Church history?

In the cathedral at Lahore there is a tablet in French's honour, on which appears, *inter alia*, the verse of Scripture which was perhaps his favourite text, one he often quoted, and on which he based the great C. M. S. sermon before referred to:—Rom. 15:16. "The minister of Jesus Christ to the Gentiles, ministering the Gospel of God, that the offering up of the Gentiles might be acceptable, being

sanctified by the Holy Ghost." This is the one place where the priestly character of missionary work is insisted on. "The minister" (λειτουργός) . . . ministering (ἱερουργοῦντα)—offering sacrifice as a priest. What was the sacrifice offered? Not "the Gospel of God," as we might carelessly read it, but the Gentile world (προσφορὰ τῶν ἐθνῶν). To offer up the Gentiles as an acceptable sacrifice to God—that was the priestly work in which St. Paul gloried, and in which Bishop Valpy French desired to take a share.

CONSTRUCTIVE QUARTERLY

VOL IV 1916

93C

GTU Library
3 2400 00273 0442